XVI.

THE MODE AND SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM:

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF

TWO DISCOURSES

Preached at Cedar Creek Church, Anson Co., N. C.,

SEPTEMBER 17, 1843:

BY THE

REV. ALEXANDER B. SMITH:

IN REPLY TO

TWO DISCOURSES, ON THE SAME SUBJECT,

DELIVERED AT THE SAME PLACE, ON THE SUNDAY PREVIOUS,

BY THE REV. R. FURMAN, OF CHERAW.

CHARLESTON, S. C.:

SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE OFFICE, 100 HAYNE-STREET.

B. JENKINS, PRINTER.

1844.

JBC
2651
Sm51m

.NX

THE MODE AND SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

MATT. XXVIII. 19—20.

"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world."

In discussing the subject of Christian Baptism I shall inquire,

I. Into the mode of baptism.

II. Who are the proper subjects of baptism.

1. There is no moral worth in mode: but mode is the mere method or manner of doing a thing, and not the thing itself. This proposition is generally and strictly true, according to the assent of the enlightened world; with the exception of one religious sect, which objects to the general principle so far as Christian Baptism is concerned,—and that sect, not more respectable for numbers, or more distinguished for piety and learning than many others. To illustrate the foregoing general principle we may remark,

First, That the pure worship of God is of equal importance with the ordinance of baptism, and yet none attach exclusive importance to any particular mode of worship. A Presbyterian congregation worship God in prayer,—all standing. A Methodist congregation worship Him,—all kneeling. A Baptist congregation worship Him,—some standing and some kneeling. And so in singing,—some worship Him standing, and some sitting. Here are several modes of worship,—modes without importance, as all agree; for one denomination will not say to another, "you do not worship, because you do not conform to our mode."

Secondly, In the sacrament of the Lord's supper,—a sacrament of equal importance with the sacrament of baptism,—there is, by the assent of all, no moral worth in mode. Methodists receive it kneeling. Baptists receive it sitting. Presbyterians receive it sitting at a table spread, as if they were about taking a common supper; while the original pattern was to receive it reclining, according to the custom of the Jews at their meals. Now, no one will rise up, with a railing accusation against the members of a sister

church, and say, "*you* do not take the sacrament of the Lord's supper, merely because you do not conform to my mode." And wherefore? Because all meet upon the truth of the proposition laid down: there is no moral worth in mode, &c. This is the ground of Pædo-baptists; and so far as this proposition concerns christian baptism, they hold that the three modes now common among Christians are all valid according to the faith of the subject, and that they all have the divine sanction.

But Mr. Furman would controvert this position. But how? Not by stating and meeting it fairly; but by stating something else in its stead, which we never held. On page 24 of his pamphlet, he says:

"A very common excuse is, that mode is not material—there is nothing in mode; and if water be applied in any way, it is baptism. This is an excuse that is offered by hundreds and thousands, who admit that immersion is the proper and most ancient mode."

It is true we hold, that so far as the three modes above specified are concerned, mode is immaterial. But when he represents us as holding, that water applied "*in any way* is baptism," he does us great injustice, for he grossly misrepresents us. We hold to no such thing. And when he says, that hundreds and thousands hold to this, "who admit that immersion is the proper, and most ancient mode," he certainly asserts that which no one but himself has found out, and that too which makes the "hundreds and thousands" of whom he speaks, the veriest hypocrites: for what else can they be while, as he says, they hold, that water applied in *any way* is baptism, and, at the same time admit that immersion is not only *a* proper mode of baptism, but *the* proper and *most ancient* mode? Why did not Mr. F. state fairly, and meet fairly, the sentiments of Pædo-baptists on the point? Why falsely represent them as holding that water applied in *any way* is baptism? The answer, I think, is plain. He would here make a thrust at them, and fearing that he might not be able to reach them on their proper ground, he took care to place them within the reach of his "sling and pebble." But again: just at this point, Mr. F. seems to have been favoured with some very brilliant conceptions, and he must needs have a peg on which to hang them, that they might make a fair showing. Here they are on the same page of his pamphlet:

"But let us for a moment suppose, that the position of our opponents is true, that mode is not material," (i. e., that water applied in *any way* is baptism,) "and see to what monstrous absurdities it will

lead. One is immersed, and he is baptized; another has water poured on him, and he is baptized; another is besprinkled, and he is baptized; another applies his foot to some water, and he is baptized; another moistens his finger in a basin, and he is baptized; another, in an unaccountable freak, applies a drop of water to his nose, and he is baptized."

What legitimate conclusions! And how *very* classic!! Now, these conclusions may be derived from his own false premises, but never from the true ground of Pædo-baptists. They certainly first existed in the very creative genius of Mr. F. They are worthy of their false premises. And shall I say that both,—premises and conclusions,—are worthy of their author? He certainly thinks so. Then let him have all the renown of having originated them. On the same page, speaking of the position which he attributes to Pædo-baptists, viz: that "water applied in any way is baptism," he says:

"I pronounce it rotten at the very core, and untrue from beginning to end."

That's right, Mr. Furman; I wish you great success in demolishing the heterodox proposition. Although it is your own false conception, I hope you will lay on, until you prove it "*rotten at the very core*," &c. On the same page, Mr. F. says:

"In the ordinance of baptism, (so far as the administration is concerned,) mode is every thing. Destroy the mode, and you destroy the baptism."

According to this declaration, *mode* is baptism, and *baptism* is mode; for you cannot destroy the one without destroying the other. Then they are convertible terms, and may be used the one for the other, without destroying the sense. Let us then substitute *mode* for *baptism* in a few passages, and test the truth of the author's declaration. St. Paul says, "One Lord—one faith—one baptism." According to the declaration of Mr. F., just quoted, the sense would not be changed by reading, One Lord—one faith—one *mode*. Again: Christ says, "Can ye be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Substitute *mode* for baptism, and you have—Can ye be *moded* with the *mode* that I am *moded* with? John says: "I indeed baptize you with water, but He (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." I indeed *mode* you with water, but He shall *mode* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire. "Then went out to him, Jerusalem and all Judea,—and were baptised of him," that is, "were *moded* of him in Jordan," &c. "But when he saw many of the Pharisees

and Sadducees come to his baptism," that is, to his *mode*, "he said unto them," &c. John preached the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,"—that is, he preached the *mode* of repentance, &c. Can any doctrine, that involves such miserable nonsense and jargon, be sound? I leave the reader to judge. Mr. Furman, and Anti-pædobaptists generally, rely with much confidence upon the scripture—"One Lord—one faith—one baptism"—to prove "one *solitary*" mode of baptism. But this text, so far from proving any thing in their favour, is against them. There is truly "One Lord." But in the Godhead there are three several persons—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. There is truly "One Faith." But there are several degrees or quantities of faith; as the faith of an awakened sinner, the faith of a newly-converted soul, and the faith of an experienced Christian. Yet it is all—"One faith"—one in kind, though existing in different degrees. So we as correctly say—"One baptism"—while there are three several appropriate modes. St. Paul, then, in this has not taught us that baptism is *mode*, as Mr. F. has attempted to do, by perverting his meaning.

On page 25 of his sermon, Mr. Furman attempts to show a necessity for a particular mode in baptism, which does not exist in the sacrament of the Lord's supper. But he does it by assuming what yet remains to be proved, viz: that immersion is the essence of baptism. He says:

"The essence of the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, consists in eating the bread and drinking the wine."

And this without any regard to quantity; for according to his own practice a bit of bread and a sip of wine are all-sufficient, although the original word for the Lord's supper means a full meal. He further says:

"The essence of baptism, consists in a burial beneath the water, and a resurrection therefrom."

And this, because, as he says, the original word βαπτιζω (baptizo) means only to immerse. Here he suddenly becomes a stickler for quantity, and must have water enough for immersion. By what rule of consistency is this? Why reject the unequivocal meaning of the original word in the former sacrament, and so tenaciously cling to what, *he says*, is the meaning of the original, in the latter sacrament? If he is right in saying, that "the essence of baptism consists in a burial beneath the water, and resurrection therefrom," because the original word means that; consistency will compel him to say, that the essence of the Lord's supper consists in taking a common meal, for the original word

means that. But no. Mode and quantity of aliment are regarded as of no importance in the sacrament of the Lord's supper; while mode is said to be "*every thing*" in the sacrament of baptism. And wherefore? Have we not as much precept and example for mode in the former sacrament as in the latter? Certainly we have. Is the Lord's supper of less importance than baptism? Certainly not. Why then disregard all mode in the one case, and rigidly confine every thing to "*one solitary*" and sectarian mode in the other? Mr. F. may write—he may talk—he may pour his oily eloquence in lubricating streams upon the ears of the public; but he will never be able to reconcile those who are wise, and unbiassed by prejudice, to such inconsistency. On the same page, we have a striking example of Mr. Furman's very splendid small talk, in a supposition which he makes. He says:

"If an individual sits at the communion table, and takes a piece of bread, and has a little wine poured into his hand, without eating and drinking, he has not partaken of the Lord's supper."

Well, suppose that he eats the "piece of bread," and drinks the "little wine," discerning the Lord's body; has he not truly partaken of the Lord's supper? Certainly he has, as Mr. F. himself will admit. Then, suppose that a person has a little water properly applied, in the name of the Holy Trinity; is he not baptized? Certainly he is; for if the "piece of bread" and "little wine," properly received, are sufficient in the one case; the little water properly applied is equally good in the other. So says consistency —so says common-sense—so say nine-tenths of the learned christian world—so God Almighty has said by his divine sanction; for, to say the least of it, He has as signally sanctioned and blessed the modes of sprinkling and pouring, as the mode of immersion; and Christians baptized by either of the former modes, are as pious, zealous, and useful, as those immersed. They abound as much in all the fruits and graces of the Holy Spirit, and at last die as triumphantly. Who will dare to deny this? Not even Mr. F. himself; for he admits it. Where, then, are the superior virtue, and exclusive importance, of immersion? They are not seen in this world, nor will they ever be seen. They only exist in the watery imagination of such zealots as the author of the pamphlet, who, in the fervour of his zeal, declares, that all other modes "*must* be abandoned sooner or later." Notwithstanding, then, all the sophistry and "childish quibbling" of Mr. F., the position with which we set out yet stands forth in all the majesty of truth. And I here repeat, that so far as the three common modes of

baptism are concerned,—There is no moral worth in mode; but mode is only a circumstance of the sacrament, and not the sacrament itself:—and yet,

2. Our Baptist brethren attach the utmost importance to mode—an importance contrary to reason—contrary to scripture—contrary to all christian charity and fellowship, and an importance which runs them into the most glaring inconsistencies.

First. Baptists attach an importance to the mode of baptism which is contrary to reason; for Mr. Furman says that in baptism "mode is every thing. Destroy the mode, and you destroy the baptism." Here he makes the thing to be done, and the mode or manner of doing it, identical. Or, in other words, he makes the *mode* of administering baptism, identical with the baptism itself—an absurdity which transcends all human reason, and needs only to be stated to be condemned.

Secondly. They attach an importance to the mode of baptism which is contrary to Scripture; for the Bible no where speaks of "*one solitary*" mode exclusive of all others, as it certainly would have done, if Baptists are right and every body else wrong. It no where teaches us that "*mode* is every thing"—thus elevating the mode of a sacrament above the sacrament itself. It no where justifies Baptists for excluding nine-tenths of the christian world from the communion-table, and from the pale of the christian church, because they have not been immersed.

Thirdly. They attach an importance to the mode of baptism which is contrary to all christian charity and fellowship; for, as above remarked, they exclude from the communion all Christians who differ from them on the mode of baptism. That we may at once see how very uncharitable, unchristian-like, and even unnatural, this is, let us suppose, what is frequently true, that, in a congregation assembled for worship at a Baptist meeting, there are ministers and members of other churches. Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian ministers all sit together in the same pulpit; they labour together in the word and doctrine; the Lord owns and blesses their joint labours; sinners are awakened; souls are converted; Christians are revived and strengthened: in a word, all worship and rejoice together as the children of one father, trusting in the same Saviour, and aiming for the same heaven. Brotherly love and the fellowship of kindred minds, seem to pervade the whole throng, and not a discordant note is heard, until the time arrives for celebrating the dying love and suffering of our Lord and Saviour. And now, why should that "broth-

erly love," which has continued for several days, be interrupted? If charity should ever abound; if christian fellowship should ever be sweetly indulged; if sectarian peculiarities should ever be laid aside, and for a time forgotten; if pure, fervent christian affection should ever unite the children of God; surely it ought to be, when they, in obedience to the last command of Jesus, surround the sacred emblems, and contemplate his dying love. But the time has arrived; the emblems of the Saviour's broken body and shed blood are prepared and consecrated, and we Methodists, Presbyterians, &c., would approach; for still we hear the Saviour say, "Do this in remembrance of me." Our souls sympathize with the scene. We call to mind the dark night—the gloomy garden—the unutterable agony—the bloody sweat—the mangled body—the gushing blood—the dying groans that struck the senseless earth with terror, when Christ the Saviour died. I say we would approach; but hark! we are told to stand off!! But why? Tell us, ye proprietors of the meeting. Have we not cheerfully laboured with you at your bidding? Has not the Lord blessed us together without distinction? Do we not all claim God for our father, Christ for our Saviour, and heaven for our home? Are we not all strangers and pilgrims, travelling to the same place? Then why exclude us? thus making a distinction, which the Lord has never made, and which is not only contrary to religion, but unnatural. Do you think there will be any such distinction in heaven? for you allow that we will get there. We are told, in answer, that we have not been baptized. But what do you mean? We were certainly baptized as we most conscientiously believed to be right, and by a mode which God has ever sanctioned. Ah, but you have not been immersed. And is that the ground upon which you exclude us? "Wonder, oh heavens, and be astonished, oh earth"!! The Baptist Church excludes nine-tenths of the christian world from the Lord's table, merely because they have not gone down to their "water mark." And, moreover, they exclude all others from the pale of the christian church for the same reason. This, Mr. Furman both admits and denies, on page 26 of his sermon. He there says:

"But if you mean by unchurching them, simply to say that we deny that they have been baptized—that we deny that they have been introduced into the visible church by the proper rite of initiation—why then it is the truth; it is scriptural truth; it is eternal truth."

Here he denies that other denominations "have been introduced into the visible church by the proper rite of initia-

tion." Then I would ask Mr. F., if there is any *im*proper rite of initiation? O no (I can answer for him.) Then there is but one proper rite of initiation into the visible church, and Mr. F. denies that other denominations have been introduced by that, and of course he denies that they are in the church at all. Thus he, without ceremony, reads all others out of the visible church, and says: "it is the truth—it is scriptural truth—it is eternal truth." But in the very next paragraph, Mr. Furman denies this, and says:

"It is not the Baptists who unchurch other denominations, but they unchurch themselves."

In the estimation of whom do other denominations stand unchurched? In the estimation of Baptists only. They declare that others are not in the visible church, because they have not been immersed, but yet, says Mr. F., they don't unchurch them. Let him talk such contradictory nonsense to children, but he ought to know better than to publish it to a discerning public. But I have more from Mr. F. on this subject. In a sermon which he published in 1840, on page 16 he says:

"And if we have not been baptized exactly in that way which Jesus requires, (i. e., immersed,) we are disobedient; and, I care not what our doctrine may be, we are still out of the pale of His visible church."

So here is Mr. F., in 1840, declaring that we are not in the pale of Christ's visible church. In 1843, declaring that we have not entered into the church by the proper rite of initiation; thus, in both these instances, positively unchurching us. And again, in 1843, denying that he does unchurch us, and declaring that we unchurch ourselves. Rather a ridiculous attitude for an author to be placed in, who prates so much about "eternal truth." The fact that our Baptist brethren unchurch *all* other denominations, gave rise to this controversy. On last summer, the Lord wonderfully blessed the labours of our ministers, brothers Durant and Tarrant, and a gracious revival of religion commenced within the bounds of this circuit. In the meantime, as is commonly the case, the Rev. James Thomas, with that proselyting cant of which he is so capable, commenced his water dirge, and publicly, at Cedar Creek, unchurched us all, and declared that we obtained our notions of baptism from the Roman Catholics. About the same time, the Rev. Mr Hays said some hard and very improper things of Mr. Wesley and the M. E. Church. Dr. Lee, too, in another part of the county, opened his battery upon us. Now, what could we do? Must we tamely submit, or

must we defend ourselves? We chose to do the latter, and the burden of the defence fell upon the writer of this pamphlet. I appointed a day, and respectfully invited those who had so unprovokedly commenced the attack, to meet me, and let us amicably discuss the subject publicly, and be done with it. But Mr. Thomas, who had very improperly thrown the first spear, and stirred the elements of war, very conveniently had other business to attend to on that occasion; and, as is commonly the case when responsibility is to be incurred, *he was not there.* But I must do him the justice to say, that, though he is not well qualified to lead forlorn hopes, or to operate in a warm, close action, yet, if you will give him his proselyting armour, he can operate splendidly in private, and do some fine manœuvreing, and make some gallant sallies when the enemy is not in sight. And when the enemy is in sight, if he can get a man to stand before him, he, from his posterior position, can give some very significant glances, some very knowing nods of the head, and some very unmistakable squints, as he did when Mr. Furman preached his sermon at Cedar Creek; but when the reply came, all his heroism seemed to gravitate towards his heels, and caused his absence. He must have a *penchant* for the Parthian mode of battle As for Mr. Hays, he attended my appointment, and, though he had the privilege of reply, he chose to say nothing. Yet it seems the germ of fight was in him, and, when it had sufficiently matured, he flew off at a tangent, and took a position in Montgomery county, twenty-five miles from the scene of action, and very bravely commenced his attack. Then there is fight in him, but it stays there till he gets 25 miles from the field of battle. He then fights manfully, when he has nobody to fight. Now, seriously; why did not Mr. Hays reply at the proper time and place, as he had a right to do, and the liberty of doing? I suppose he had caught the spirit of his brother Thomas. But a layman of Mr. Thomas's church met me at my appointment, and bravely attempted that from which his clerical brethren shrunk. He breasted the conflict when his general had fled. This was certainly chivalrous in him, whether he came up under the charge and direction of his superior officers, or whether he came to fight on his own hook. However that may be, the whole matter of controversy, and manner of contending, were *Greek* to him. He did no execution. He only *tried.* And now what was to be done? Those who had so unjustifiably commenced the attack, more ingloriously fled from it on the very first appearance of defence. In this exigency, a stronger arm was

called from another State, to contend in a conflict which they were imprudent enough to commence, but which they neither had the courage nor the ability to prosecute. Hence this unpleasant controversy. And I here, as I did publicly at Cedar Creek, charge the responsibility of the controversy upon Mr. Thomas and his coadjutors, who affect to know so much evil of Mr. Wesley and the M. E. Church, and who commenced it when we were pursuing the even tenor of our way, and interrupting nobody. I advise them to let Mr. Wesley alone. He and his doctrines have long since passed the ordeal of fire. They have been tried by ecclesiastics of the best talent both in England and America, and they yet stand forth as gold purified. It is very strange, that men of their mental calibre should attempt to derogate from the immortal fame of John Wesley, or to bring into disrepute this doctrine of the M. E. Church, when a host of *real* talent on both sides of the Atlantic has failed to do it. But folly is generally found coupled with ignorance. If God has called these men to preach the gospel, *that* is their appropriate work. It is no part of their commission to misrepresent Wesley and the church which he founded; and whenever they attempt it, they will find that they have mistaken their calling. But I am digressing too far from my main subject. I remark,

Fourthly, That our Baptist brethren attach an importance to their mode of baptism which involves them in the grossest inconsistencies. They admit that the ministers of other denominations are truly called of God, and divinely commissioned to preach the gospel; hence they frequently invite them to preach in their pulpits. But at the same time, they deny that they have the authority to administer what they call christian baptism. So that, if a regularly ordained minister of another church immerses a person, and that person should afterwards join the Baptist church, they will immerse him again, declaring his former baptism to be invalid. This is elevating a mere circumstance of a gospel ordinance above the gospel itself. This is saying, that God calls, divinely qualifies, and sends forth a man to preach his everlasting gospel, who is not fit to administer an ordinance of the gospel. Moreover, they declare, that these accredited ministers of Jesus Christ, and all that are in communion with them, are not in the pale of Christ's visible church; and yet they acknowledge them to be good Christians, on their way to heaven. This is saying, that God has called and sent forth men to preach his gospel, who are not only unfit to administer the ordinance of baptism, but who are not even in Christ's visible church. It is further

saying, that more than nine-tenths of the christian world, ministers and people, are going to heaven out of the church. Then where is the use of a church? Was it instituted for the exclusive benefit of Baptists, and can all the rest do as well without it?

Again: while Baptists admit that other denominations are orthodox in the cardinal doctrines of Christianity—pious, zealous, and useful, as saints of the most high God, and prepared for the church triumphant; yet they exclude them, one and all, from the Lord's table, merely because they have not been immersed. This is saying that their communion table is more holy than heaven; for, while they admit that other Christians will be saved in heaven, they hold them to be unfit for their communion. This is, farther, making a condition in order to communion on earth, which will not be made in order to eternal communion in heaven. In other words, the Baptists require *more* of us to be admitted to their communion table, than God will require of us to be admitted into heaven.

Finally: all this is elevating immersion, in point of importance, above every thing else in the whole christian system, from beginning to end: for a Christian may be as orthodox and zealous as St. Paul—he may be as meek as Moses—as patient as Job—as self-denying and laborious as Wesley and Asbury—he may be an "Israelite indeed in whom is no guile"—standing as a shock of ripe corn ready to be gathered into the garner of the Lord; and yet if he has not been immersed, according to Baptist usage and teaching, he is unfit to administer christian baptism—he is not in the pale of Christ's visible church—he is not fit for the Baptist communion table. These are inconsistencies, aye, absurdities, that ought to make the cheek of every one that holds them burn with shame. While upon the subject of close communion, let me introduce the testimony of the Rev. Robert Hall against it. Mr. Hall was one of the most pious, learned, and able ministers that ever was in the Baptist church. His views were not circumscribed by the lines of sectarian exclusiveness, but they were enlightened and charitable. Speaking of close communion, and the unfavourable light in which the public view it, he says: *"It is too much to expect that an enlightened public will be eager to enrol themselves among the members of a sect which displays much of the intolerance of popery, without any portion of its splendour, and prescribes, as the pledge of conversion, the renunciation of the whole world."—"What can be the motive of the advocates

* Hall's Works, vol. i., pp. 502–504.

of strict communion for studiously presenting every possible obstacle to the exclusive diffusion of our principles?—"When we have learned to make no difference where the Searcher of hearts makes none, we shall at least improve ourselves, wipe off the reproach of bigotry and intolerance. and rise in the esteem of a religious and enlightened public, by convincing them that our zeal for a ceremonial institution has not betrayed us into a forgetfulness that 'love is the fulfilling of the law.'"

I would here ask my candid Baptist friends, if they do not think, that the enlightened and liberal views of Mr. Hall are not more in accordance with the true spirit of Christianity than the views and practice of the Baptist church, which still keeps up close communion? Is it right to make a difference where the Searcher of hearts has made none? Is it right that your zeal for a ceremonial institution, which you acknowledge is not essential to salvation, should cause you to forget that "love is the fulfilling of the law? Is it right that you should be denied the privilege of communing with those among whom many of you were awakened and converted? In a word, are you not convinced, that your church lays too much stress upon the rite of immersion? Answer candidly, honestly and in the fear of God. And I here especially address myself to the Rev. Mr. Furman "*of Cheraw.*" Will you, sir, turn to the 23d page of your sermon of 1840, and to the 26th page of your sermon of 1843? You will there find that you have used the following language:

"Wesley was a man who feared God, who trusted in Jesus as the only Saviour, and who was honoured to be a vessel of mercy, and an instrument of righteousness."

Speaking of his followers you say:

"They are a zealous, doing people—the children of God—among the number of his people, and they will form a part of the church triumphant in heaven."

Now, sir, I ask you, would you have permitted this same Wesley, who feared God,—who was a vessel of mercy, and an instrument of righteousness, to commune with you? And do you now permit his followers, who, you say, are zealous, doing people,—the children of God, and will form a part of the church triumphant in heaven, to commune with you? And, if not, upon what ground do you exclude them? You will say, it is because they have not been immersed. Then I ask you farther, is not this making immersion the paramount consideration? Is it not giving to it an importance superior to that of every thing else in

the whole christian system? And yet you say;—that people living in the neglect of this, the most important christian duty, and teaching others so to do, will be saved. How is this, sir? Will a just God who has said, "he that offends in one point is guilty of the whole," save people who live in the neglect of this most important duty, when they have the means of knowing and doing better? And if he will, will he ever condemn any for minor offences, while he justifies others in the neglect of the most weighty and important matter of Christianity? These questions I propound to you as a candid and pious christian minister. Will you answer them directly, and without evasion? I trow not, for in doing so, you will have to give up your high ground as to immersion, and admit us to your communion table; or be driven to the necessity of holding the monstrous absurdity, that the just and holy God will save those who are unfit for your communion, and who are living in the neglect of the most important christian duty; or you will have to hold and teach, that all Pædo-baptists will be lost. And this last is the only consistent ground upon which you can stand with your present exclusive and high notions of immersion; for surely, if we are not in the pale of Christ's visible church; if we are unfit for your communion; if we are living in the neglect of the most important christian duty, when we have the means of knowing and doing better, we are unfit for heaven. And I would fain hope, if I could, that your church in future, would be consistent, and while she declares us unfit for her communion, declare us, at the same time, unfit to preach in her pulpits; and, while she declares that we are not in Christ's church militant, declare that we are unfit for the church triumphant. This would be consistent. It would at once exhibit the true ground upon which your exclusive notions place you. And, sir, you had as well come out. It is becoming too late in the day to keep your errors in the shades of a drivelling inconsistency; for, if people can get to heaven as well without immersion as with it, why make so much noise about it? Why disturb whole communities—why compass sea and land to make one proselyte to it? The public mind is making these inquiries. The people are in search after the truth of the importance which you attach to immersion, and in that search they will find all your lurking places of inconsistency; nor will they be content, until they trace your absurd views on this subject to their proper results.

Farther, sir: As you have publicly read all Pædo-baptists out of the pale of Christ's visible church, will you be so kind as to tell us how we stand, where we stand, and what

relation we sustain to Christ? If we are not in the pale of his visible church, has he any *in*visible church on the earth? And if he has, are we in that? And if we are, does it dispense with immersion? And if it does, what other indulgences does it grant? How wide does it make the road? But if Christ has no invisible church which accomodates itself to our errors, upon what principle then may we expect to be saved? Do you say upon the score of ignorance? for you taunt us with ignorance in your sermon. That will not do; for we have all the means of knowing better, and God will not wink at wilful ignorance. Do you say that we must depend upon the uncovenanted mercies of God for salvation? Then tell us what are those uncovenanted mercies? When were they promised, and to whom, and how far do they extend? for we have never read of them in the Bible, or elsewere, except in the writings of those who take it upon themselves to unchurch others. The matter is mysterious to us. We cannot see how we can be saved out of the church. You say we are not in the church, and yet we shall be saved; then surely you can tell us how, even if the manner is somewhat mysterious; for I judge from the 7th article of the creed of your church, as laid down in your sermon of 1840, that you belong to that school of divines who sometimes speak of "the secret will of God." Then if you have so far been indoctrinated into these *profunda arcana*, as to have learned something of the secret will of God, surely you can explain to us the secret of being saved without the church.

The Rev. Robert Hall, as before quoted, speaking of close communion, &c., says, the Baptist church displays much of the intolerance of popery. The remark is true, at least in one respect; and the relative position of the two churches is somewhat amusing. The Pope of Rome, proud of the imaginary glory of infallibility, and of his divine right to universal dominion, both civil and ecclesiastical, pompously sits in the chair of St. Peter, and thunders forth from the Vatican the curse of heresy upon the whole protestant world. And the anathema comes booming over the stormy Atlantic, and in terrific tones it falls upon our American shores, and rolls its harsh notes over hill and dale, mountain and vale, until the whole country is filled with its awful reverberations. But stop, Mr. Pope. We have some thunder in America too, for here are the Rev. Mr. Thomas of Anson, and the Rev. Mr. Furman "*of Cheraw*," who, inspired with all the confidence of infallibility as to the mode of baptism, rise up at Cedar Creek, and with voice extended, hands uplifted, and manner vehe-

ment, hurl back the same iron curses of heresy and excommunication upon your devoted head, and upon the heads of all protestant Pædo-baptists, who, they say, are either your children, or your grand-children. Here, then, gentle reader, is thunder for you—thunder against thunder—Popish thunder against Baptist thunder, and Baptist thunder against Popish thunder. Well, we can only say, let the zealous prelates thunder on: but after they have exhausted all their arsenals of mighty thunder, they will find, if not before, they are unable to thunder down what the LORD omnipotent has built up.

As a farther proof of the undue importance which our Baptist brethren attach to the rite of immersion, let it be remembered, that on this very account they, a few years ago, separated, as a church, from the American Bible Society. That is, they separated because that Society would not appropriate funds to publish an edition of the Scriptures, so altered as to suit their sectarian notions of baptism. This I published in the discussions of last summer, and it was publicly denied; but, upon a re-examination into the matter, I find that I was then right, and the circumstances which led to the separation are as follows:

"At a meeting of the board of managers of the American Bible Society, held on the 6th August, 1835, Mr. Pearce, a Baptist missionary at Calcutta, made application for funds to aid in printing the New Testament in the Bengali language. A similar application had previously been made to the Calcutta Bible Society, and to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and by each denied. The reason for this refusal was the fact, that, in the version for which aid was solicited, the Greek words Βαπτιζω, (*baptiso,*) Βαπτισμα, (*baptisma,*) and their derivatives, were translated by phrases which, in that language, signify to immerse, immersion, &c."

That is, Mr. Pearce solicited funds to aid in printing an edition of the New Testament, so altered, that none of the seven denominations, which were united in the American Bible Society, could use it, except Baptists.

"This request of Mr. Pearce was referred by the board of managers of the A. B. Society to the committee on distribution, who reported at the next regular meeting, to wit, on the 3d of September following, that in their opinion it was inexpedient to make any appropriation, until the board settle a principle in relation to the Greek word Βαπτιζω. This report having been accepted, the whole subject was referred to a special committee of seven, which was composed of one from each of the religious denominations represented in the board," (to wit, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Baptist, a Methodist, a Moravian, a Quaker, and a member of the Dutch Reformed Church.) "At the meeting in October, the committee brought in a report

adverse to the request of Mr. Pearce, for reasons therein assigned. At the next regular meeting, the whole subject came up again, and was finally referred back to the same committee of seven, who, at a special meeting on the 19th of November, made the following report:

"The Committee to whom was recommitted the determining of a principle upon which the American Bible Society will aid in printing and distributing the Bible in foreign languages, beg leave to report:

"That they are of opinion that it is expedient to withdraw their former report *on the particular case*, and to present the following on the general principle:

"By the constitution of the American Bible Society its managers are, in the circulating of the Holy Scriptures, restricted to such copies as are 'without note or comment;' and, in the English language, to the 'version in common use.' The design of these restrictions clearly seems to have been to simplify and mark out the duties of the Society, so that all religious denominations of which it is composed might harmoniously unite in performing these duties.

"As the managers are now called to aid extensively in circulating the sacred scriptures in languages other than the English, they deem it their duty, in conformity with the obvious spirit of their compact, to adopt the following resolutions as the rule of their conduct in making appropriations for the circulation of the scriptures in all *foreign tongues.*

"*Resolved*, That in appropriating money for translating, printing, or distributing the sacred scriptures in foreign languages, the managers feel at liberty to encourage only such versions as conform in their principles of translation to the common English version, at least so far that all the religious denominations represented in this Society can consistently use and circulate said versions in their several schools and communities.

"*Resolved*, That a copy of the above preamble and resolution be sent to each of the missionary boards accustomed to receive pecuniary grants from this Society, with a request that the same may be transmitted to their respective mission stations, where the scriptures are in process of translation; and also that the several missionary boards be informed that their applications for aid be accompanied with a declaration that the versions which they propose to circulate are executed in accordance with the above resolution."

After mature deliberation, the above report was accepted by the board of managers, and the resolutions adopted as rules for their future government, on the 17th Feb., 1836. This gave rise to the secession of the Baptist church, which took place soon after.

Now, why did the Baptist church secede? Not because the A. B. Society had violated its constitution, as some have unwittingly and very erroneously said; but because it would *not* violate its constitution, and every principle of Christian propriety, by making every thing bend, aye, even

the Scriptures themselves, to the sectarianism of the Baptist church. The constitution of the A. B. Society requires that the holy scriptures shall be sent abroad "without note or comment." This is the correct principle. Upon it, all protestant donominations ought to meet in harmony, each one using the common version of the Scriptures, which all have used so long, and expounding it to their people as they think proper. But the request of Mr. Pearce, sanctioned by the Baptist church, required the violation of this principle. It is true they did not ask for funds to aid in publishing notes or comments upon the Holy Scriptures, but, what is worse, they asked for aid in altering the sacred text. I suppose the most violent sectarian would care but very little for the privilege of noting and commenting, if allowed to alter the sacred text at pleasure. I have been somewhat surprised at the exultation of Mr. Furman and others, in sending the Bible to the heathen, as they say, "without note or comment." Mr. F., in his sermon of 1840, page 26, says:

"But *we* send the Bible without note or comment; not even a little note, to remind the poor heathen that they must be sure to remember the Baptist *water mark*."

This he publishes to the world, when at the same time he knows, or ought to know, that his church so alters the sacred text, as to remind the poor heathen of the Baptist "*water mark*."

On the 26th of April, 1837, the Baptist church, by her delegates in convention assembled, formed a bible society, separate and distinct from the American Bible Society. And what, gentle reader, do you think they named it? Why, surely they give it its appropriate patronymic name, The Baptist New-Translation Bible Society. But no. Propriety, and all fitness in the conception of a name, must, in this instance, give way to magnificence, and by a misnomer they call it, "The American and Foreign Bible Society." American! Well, it would seem, that the framers of this Society must have thought, that whatever is *Baptist* is *American*, and whatever is *American* is *Baptist;* that is, that *American* and *Baptist* are synonimous terms. An inhabitant of another continent, unacquainted with the political and ecclesiastical condition of our country, judging from the name of the above society, and knowing it to be of Baptist origin, and under Baptist influence, would at once conclude, that the Baptist is the American or national church, and that other denominations, if doing any thing at all in the Bible cause, must only be operating under the wing, and by the permission, of this great "national con-

cern," and upon so small a scale as hardly to deserve a name. Or, believing in the truth of the very homely adage, that "a name goes very far with some folks", they may have thought to make up by the charm of a name, what the society lacked in other respects. Or their design in naming their society may be more laudable yet. They may have intended, that in its magnitude it shall ultimately be commensurate with the great name which they have given it; for in the report of their incipient organization, page 21, they tell us:

"This is the first Bible Society, formed under the direction of the Baptist denomination, with the avowed intention of giving to THE WHOLE WORLD A LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE WORD OF GOD."

Again:

"The board of managers are satisfied, that the providence of God has made it the duty of Baptists to give to *the whole world a faithful translation of the Bible*."—Ibid. p. 51.

Again:—In the annual report of the new society for the year 1838, the managers of the society say:

"Let the American and Foreign Bible Society be untrammeled by any restrictions; let it be what its name imports; let it be a BIBLE SOCIETY FOR THE WHOLE WORLD."—Report, page 36.

Let none be surprized, then, if this new organization magnify its name yet more, by changing it from "*American*" to UNIVERSAL; for we learn from the above quotations, that they assume to believe, that providence has made it their duty to give to the WHOLE WORLD, a literal and faithful translation of the Bible; and that theirs is a BIBLE SOCIETY FOR THE WHOLE WORLD.

Upon the whole, as names are always plenty, and as they are often very arbitrarily applied, we are willing to grant that the convention had the liberty of giving to the new society that name which suited them best; but they ought to have remembered, that with the wise a name is nothing, and that a discerning public will detect the gross anomaly of applying such a name to an institution purely sectarian. But they assume to believe, that God in his providence has called them to the great work of giving to the whole world a faithful and literal translation of the Bible. If this assumption is correct, then the American Bible Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Calcutta Bible Society, and all others in the world, may cease to operate, and lie upon their oars; indeed they ought to do so; for, according to the declarations of this new society, (as I shall show presently,) they have all the time been obscuring a part of God's holy word, by the

"popish artifice of transfer"—they have been publishing and sending forth unfaithful versions of the Holy Scriptures. Then, according to their assumption, it comes to this at last,—that the American and Foreign, i. e., the Baptist Bible Society is right, and all others wrong; for, if God in his providence has specially called and set them apart for the great work of giving to the whole world a faithful and literal translation of the Bible, surely he would not frustrate his own great design, by giving his divine sanction to others who are publishing and sending forth *unfaithful* versions of that holy book; and if they have not his divine sanction, they are certainly wrong. Indeed, the principles of our Baptist brethren generally lead to this point, when traced to their legitimate results,—that *they* are right, and all others wrong. I mention these things to show the truth of my main position,—that Baptists attach an undue importance to immersion; for it is their zeal for the rite of immersion which runs them into these gross and uncharitable absurdities and inconsistencies.

I have said that the new society, which assumes so much, is sectarian. This is denied; but I prove it from the following arguments:

1st. From the cause and fact of its origin. The Baptist church would not conform to a principle, upon which all the other denominations in the American Bible Society united:—that is, to follow the common version in printing the holy scriptures for circulation in this country, and in heathen countries. Now, this was treating all alike, for all had been using and circulating the common version for several generations, even since the reign of King James. But our Baptist brethren were not satisfied thus to stand upon equal ground with the other six denominations with which they were associated. They must have a translation to suit their sectarian notion of baptism. And because the A. B. Society would not compromit its just and very wholesome principle of action, and bend to the Baptist standard, they separated and set up for themselves. What stronger proof of sectarianism than this could be required or given? It is true that, in their first annual report, the managers of the new society say,—"that it is not their main design to contend for the translation of the word *baptizo*;—but, as *Baptists*, they are contending for *a great principle*, viz: that the whole of God's word should be *faithfully translated* and given to all mankind." Why is this said but to save appearances? Is "*the whole of God's word*" translated wrong, and are they about to give us a new translation out and out? Whoever will examine into the matter,

will not merely be led, but *forced*, if need be, to the conclusion, that their zeal for immersion was the ground-work of their separation.

2dly. I argue secondly, the sectarianism of the society in question, from the fact, that it has actually so altered the common version of the Sacred Scriptures, as to suit its sectarian views of baptism. It is true, that the society has not attempted the extensive circulation of the New Bible in this country ; but I cannot see, if it is sincere, why it should not ; it ought to give us, "who are perishing at its very doors for lack of knowledge," as its managers say, tens of thousands in this country are, as good a bible as it sends to the heathen. But, perhaps, our brethren who are so ready to supply us and the world with the "bread of life," in the shape of a new translation of the Bible, think, that the Christian public will not, very readily, fall out with that good old version of the Bible, which our forefathers loved and read, and which has guided so many millions safely to heaven. If so, I trow that they think right; for it would be very silly in the rest of the christian world, to loose from their safe and long-tried moorings, for the chance of an experimental cruise upon the untried sea of the baptist scheme. And our brethren may be well assured, that the public mind will have to be carried back many degrees upon the dial of intelligence, before their scheme can have that universal success at which they seem to aim.

3dly. I argue thirdly, the sectarianism of the society in question, from its constitution :

"Art. VI. Such life-directors as are members in good standing of *Baptist* churches, shall *be* members of the board."

"Art. VIII. A board of managers shall be appointed to conduct the business of the society, consisting of thirty-six brethren in good standing in *Baptist* churches," &c.

What can be more plain? If it is not sectarian, why exclude all except Baptists from any part in the management of its concerns? Much more proof might be brought to the same point, but it is needless.

Since writing the above I learn, that it is said, that the denominational character of the society is to be changed by an amendment of the 6th and 8th articles, which was proposed at the last anniversary, and is to be acted on at the next. Let us see then what the amendment is intended to effect. It reads thus:

"Art. 6th. All life-directors shall have the privilege of participating in the deliberations of the board, and such life-directors as are members in good standing in their respective churches, shall be members of the board."

"Art. 8th. A board of thirty-six managers shall be appointed to conduct the business of this Society ; and so long as the larger portion of the funds shall be contributed by one denomination, the majority of this Board shall be brethren in good standing in the churches of that denomination, and the remainder may be chosen from other members of the society ; the whole board to be elected annually by the society, and to hold their office until superseded by a new election. The board shall have power to fill such vacancies as may occur in their number."

A slight examination of the proposed amendment will be sufficient to show, that if it should be made, it will make no change in the character of the society ; it will remain as exclusively Baptist in its management as ever. As the object of the society, as ascertained by the causes which produced its separate organization, is to sustain the baptist version of the Scriptures, it cannot be supposed that other denominations will ever contribute much to sustain this version, of which they do not, and cannot, consistently approve ; much less can it be supposed, that any one of these non-concurring denominations will ever contribute more largely to the society than the baptist denomination whose the society is. Then it is morally certain, that the management of the affairs of the society must always remain with the Baptists.

It is very much feared, that this is but another manœuvre to save appearances. But will our Baptist brethren permit us to suggest to them, that it will never do,—that the public mind is too intelligent to be gulled and bamboozled in this way ? After all their efforts to hide the sectarian deformity of their new organization, by hanging about it the trappings of plausibility, its true character is still visible to the discerning eye. In this way they may deceive the ignorant *few*; but the intelligent *many* will know the reality. If they wish the world to believe their society non-sectarian, let them make it so in earnest. Then it will be believed, but not before.

I had intended to rely on the three foregoing arguments to prove the sectarian character of the Baptist Bible Society; but the reader will indulge me in one other brief argument which now suggests itself to my mind, and which so plainly shows the sectarian design of the new organization, that it would seem none can doubt it.

Soon after the formation of said society, the Rev. A. Maclay was sent to England as its agent, to form what is now called the Bible Translation Society. The object of that society was to aid the Baptist Bible Society of this country in carrying out its chief design. Mr. Maclay was

successful, as we learn from what he writes to Spencer H. Cone, president of the new society. He says:

"DEAR BROTHER CONE:—My mission to Great Britain, through the divine blessing, has been crowned with success. It has aided in the formation of the Bible Translation Society, whose object is to promote the circulation of *faithful* versions of the Sacred Scriptures in all languages."

The second article of the constitution of this society explains to us what our brother Maclay, and Baptists generally, mean by faithful translations, and shows what the main design of the Baptist Bible Society is. It is as follows:

"2. It shall be the object of this society to encourage the production and circulation of complete translations of the Holy Scriptures, competently authenticated for fidelity, *it always being understood*, that the words relating to the ordinance of BAPTISM, *shall be translated by terms signifying* IMMERSION."

This is plain, and we like plain dealing. Here the main purpose of the Bible Translation Society, which acts in aid of the American and Foreign, or Baptist Bible Society, is fully set forth, and that purpose is as fully sectarian; for it is to be *always understood*, that in translating the Bible, the words relating to baptism shall be translated by terms signifying "IMMERSION." I said before that the zeal of our Baptist brethren for the rite of immersion, was the groundwork of these late movements, and that, therefore, their new society is sectarian; and here we have it abundantly confirmed by their own testimony.

In the above quoted article of the Bible Translation Society we have an example of the inveterate tenacity with which our Baptist brethren cling to immersion. In that article it is declared to be the object of the Society to encourage the production and circulation of complete translations of the holy scriptures, competently authenticated for fidelity. Well, this is all very good. We would like to have these *complete* translations of the Bible, and we would like to have them competently authenticated for fidelity too. But mark, gentle reader; the latter part of the article contains an exception in favor of immersion, for, *it must always be understood that the words relating to the ordinance of baptism shall be translated by terms signifying immersion.*" Yes, at all events, it *must* be so. It is the understanding that it *shall* be so, even though such a translation may not be competently authenticated for fidelity. Then, at all hazards, the "Baptist water-mark" is to be observed in the translations of the society. This

is but another evidence of the paramount importance which our Baptist brethren attach to the rite of immersion.

After all, our Baptist brethren deny that their Bible Society is sectarian, and charge, in advance, that the American Bible Society is sectarian, and that, on account of this sectarianism, they were forced to separate and set up for themselves. That is, the American Bible Society is sectarian, because it would adhere to its constitution, which requires it to send forth the Bible without note or comment, and because it would not violate its most excellent rule of action, which requires it, in printing the holy scriptures for this country and for heathen lands, to follow the common version—a version which all, even Baptists themselves, have used for generations. And the American and Foreign, or Baptist Bible Society is not sectarian, although it was originated because the American Bible Society would not appropriate funds to publish an edition of the holy scriptures, so altered as to suit the sectarian views of the Baptist church in reference to baptism. In other words, the American Bible Society is sectarian, although it embraces all the leading denominations of this country except two—the Baptists and Roman Catholics. And the Baptist Bible Society is not sectarian, although it is under the entire control of the Baptist church, and so likely ever to remain, and none, I believe, but immersionists are in union with them; and farther, their professed object is, to alter the common version of the scriptures, so as to sustain their sectarian views, at least in one very material point. Shall I say that this is amusing? I would rather say that it is grossly absurd. And I will farther say, that reason must leave her empire, and some dread fatuity must usurp her place, before the christian public can be brought to subscribe to such an absurdity.

As a further evidence that our Baptist brethren attach too much importance to immersion, let us look for a moment at the uncharitable language into which their zeal for that rite often betrays them.

The Rev. Mr. Maclay, writing from Mobile, whither he had gone as the special agent of the incipient organization, under date of April 19, 1837, says:

"Our brethren consider the course adopted by Bible Societies in three-quarters of the globe as an UNHOLY LEAGUE *to suppress a part of the eternal truth of God.*"—Const., &c., Ap. p. 73.

A very serious charge this; and very awful too, if true. But is it true, that three-quarters of the globe, viz: the American, the British and Foreign, and the Calcutta Bible

Societies have entered into an "*unholy league* to suppress a part of God's eternal truth"? "UNHOLY LEAGUE"! Well, whatever is unholy is sinful, and whatever is sinful is of the Devil, for "the Devil sinneth from the beginning." An unholy league, then, is a league with the Devil. Then, according to Mr. Maclay, the three most prominent Bible Societies in the world, are in league with the Devil to suppress a part of the eternal truth of God. What a specimen of christian temper and christian charity is this, to come as it does from a special and honored agent of the Baptist Bible Society! And I blush for the sacred office, when I remember that he is an accredited minister of Jesus Christ.

Again:—In the report of their incipient organization, pp. 73–4, this same brother Maclay treats us to another of his very chaste and tender effusions. Hear him:—

"For it would seem that *they*" (the other Bible Societies of the world) "*are more zealous to conceal* from the nations the real meaning of the ordinance of baptism than to give the unadulterated Bible of God to men."

Hear brother Maclay again; for in matters of detraction he is a master spirit, and in the proceedings of the new organization, he is permitted to figure largely in the peculiarities of his own style. He is now writing from England, and, if we might judge from his effusions, we should conclude that he is almost rabid upon the subject of baptism. Of the British and Foreign Bible Society he says:

"A Society that has treated us" (Baptists) "with injustice and contempt, and by their actions say, that *they would rather see the heathen perish* in their idolatry, ignorance, and unbelief, than give them a Bible that shall inform them the exact mind of the Holy Spirit on the subject of baptism," &c.—Letter dated Bristol, England, April 13, 1840. 3d Report, p. 76.

Again; R. W. Cushman, in speaking of the resolutions of the American Bible Society, already mentioned, says:

"Thus is a principle adopted for their future operations in Bible translation which requires the missionaries of the Baptist denomination, in giving light to those who are sitting in darkness and the shadow of death, *to hold back and cover up a part of the truth*, as the price of the aid of the society in disclosing the rest." Second Report. p. 46.

Again; in the appendix to the third report, there is the copy of a letter from the board of managers of the Baptist Bible Society, to the Baptist churches in England, bearing the signatures of Spencer H. Cone, the President, Wm. Parkinson, and Charles G. Somers, the corresponding secre-

tary. The letter, after saying much more, holds the following language:

"Why should they" (the Baptists of Great Britain) "not thus unite, when it is known that the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the American Bible Society *have virtually combined to obscure, at least, a part of the divine revelation?*"

These are some of the weighty charges which are brought against nine-tenths, if not nineteen-twentieths, of the christian world, by our Baptist brethren, and which are reiterated in almost every form of expression in the proceedings and reports of the Baptist Bible Society. But let us look seriously at these charges. The principal Bible Societies of the world are charged with entering into an "unholy league to suppress a part of the eternal truth of God." They are charged with concealing the truth from the nations. They are charged with preferring to see the heathen perish in their idolatry and ignorance, to giving them a correct translation of the Bible. They are charged with requiring missionaries to hold back and cover up a part of the truth. They are charged with having combined to obscure a part of divine revelation, &c., &c. These charges, if true, ought to consign the American Bible Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Calcutta Bible Society, to the execration of the world; and if true, they would consign these societies to the damnation of hell; for "*if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life*," &c. Thus, we have another specimen of the very absurd and uncharitable lengths into which this untempered zeal for immersion carries its votaries. And I now appeal to the intelligent christian public, and ask, if that principle can be right which involves all this, and which is therefore so contrary to every rule in the code of christian charity? And I especially appeal to my candid Baptist friends, and again ask, are you not by this time convinced, that you, as a church, attach too much importance to the rite of immersion? But before you answer, let us recapitulate. I think I have fully proved, that you give to immersion an importance which is contrary to reason, contrary to scripture, contrary to all christian charity and fellowship,—an importance which is above every thing else in the whole christian system from beginning to end, and an importance which often involves the grossest inconsistency and absurdity. For upon this ground you exclude all others from the Holy Communion, and thus declare non-intercourse with the whole christian world. Upon this ground you exclude all others from the pale of Christ's visible Church

thus taking it upon yourselves to do more than Christ himself has ever done; for instead of spurning us from his presence as heretics, stinking with the abominations of popery, (for Mr. Furman says we are upholding its main pillar,) he has ever owned and abundantly blessed us. Upon this ground many of the ministers and members of your church, especially in this part of the country, foster that low-bred spirit of proselyting, which lives in the midst of prejudice and envy, *and they practise it too*; and they sometimes seem to exult more when they have proselyted one from a sister church, than when they have taken one from the ranks of Satan. Upon this ground you as a church separated from the American Bible Society, thus producing strife among the hosts of Israel, united for the accomplishment of a very great and pious design. Upon this ground you have altered the common version of the holy scriptures—a version so long used by all; thus ministering to that strife. Upon this ground your church has brought the most weighty and awful charges against the most prominent Bible Societies in three quarters of the world; charges which, if true, would consign these societies to endless perdition. One of the charges is, that these societies have entered into an unholy league, that is, a league with the Devil, to suppress a part of God's eternal truth. Finally, upon this ground, your church,—a small part of God's Israel, without any distinction above others, either for learning or piety, and as Robert Hall, your own learned and pious Hall, says, displaying "much of the intolerance of popery,"—assumes to be right while all others are wrong.

Now, whatever may be your answer in view of all this, I here premise, that, against all these exclusive claims, bold prerogatives, and startling assumptions, there are, prior to all critical enquiry, several strong presumptive arguments.

1. If, among the doctrines and usages of Christianity, immersion is of paramount importance, that is, if there can be no christian communion, nor even a visible church of Christ without it; there can be no doubt but it would have been as plainly and unequivocally set forth as any other cardinal doctrine of the Bible. So that all probability of a difference of opinion in reference to this matter would have been as utterly precluded, as in reference to the doctrine of salvation by faith in Jesus Christ.

2. As the christian religion is designed to be universal, it is not probable that a mode of baptism should be enjoined as the only allowable mode, which is incompatible

with many climates and constitutions. For in the high latitudes of America, Europe and Asia ; and in Greenland, Lapland, Iceland, &c., it would be impracticable to immerse for the greater part of the year, their waters all being bound in chains of ice. And are not those ends of the earth to receive the gospel? And if they are, shall the ministers of Christ be rigidly confined to a mode of baptism which they cannot administer for many months in every year? In all climates immersion is incompatible with the health and condition of some, and in very high latitudes, it would be very hazardous to many, for more than half the year, if it could be attended to at all. Immersion, rigidly enforced under all these circumstances, would seem to be rather a yoke of bondage, than a pleasing ordinance of the gospel of mercy and peace.

3. "It is exceedingly improbable that in such circumstances of climate, and the unfrequent use of the bath, a mode of baptizing should have been appointed, which, from the shivering, the sobbing, and other bodily uneasiness produced, should distract the thoughts, and unfit the mind for a collected performance of a religious and solemn act of devotion."

4. "It is highly improbable," (as will be more fully shown hereafter,) "that the three thousand converts at the Pentecost, who, let it be observed, were baptized on the same day, were all baptized by immersion; or that the jailor and 'all his' were baptized in the same manner *in the night*, although the Baptists have invented 'a tank or a bath in the prison at Philippi' for that purpose."

5. It is exceedingly improbable that the Baptist church alone is right, and that all other churches are wrong, while it is granted that these other churches are equally learned, pious, and conscientious—thus having the means of knowing, as well as the disposition to know, the right way.

6. Finally: the admissions of the Baptist church constitute an argument sufficiently strong to cancel all their exclusive claims; for they admit that the members of other churches will be saved without immersion. Then if people can get to heaven without immersion as well as with it, all the disturbance that they create about it is unnecessary, and all their high claims and bold assumptions are preposterous and absurd.

3. In the grand order of this discussion, let us notice, thirdly, the principal grounds upon which Baptists rest their favourite dogma—that immersion is the only allowable mode of baptism. Of these grounds there are four.

1. The antiquity of immersion as historically ascertained. 2. The meaning of the Greek word Βαπτιζω, (baptizo.) 3. The testimony of eminent Paedo-baptist writers. 4. The testimony of Scripture.

1. First then: the antiquity of immersion as historically ascertained. We neither deny the antiquity nor the validity of immersion; but we do object to being bound down to immersion, or any other custom, merely because it is ancient. Mr. Furman quotes Mosheim to show that baptism was performed by immersion in the second century. The Baptist argument runs thus: the church, thus early, gives us the true pattern of baptism as derived from the Apostles —that pattern is immersion, and we ought therefore to receive it as the only allowable mode. But who has ever proved that the practice of the church in the second century, was the original apostolical practice? This is a mere assumption which yet remains to be proved, and which, it is believed, cannot be proved. The very ground-work of the argument, then, is defective, and of course all its parts fall to the ground. But let us inquire what was the custom of the ancient church. 1. They baptized by immersion. 2. They baptized men and women naked. 3. They dipped the person three times. 4. They gave the baptized person milk and honey to drink. 5. They anointed him with a kind of unction. 6. They marked him with the sign of the cross. 7. They used exorcism, a kind of incantation of witchcraft, to drive the Devil away. That they baptized their subjects naked, is abundantly confirmed by Robinson in his History of Baptism. He says:

"The primitive Christians baptized naked. There is no ancient historical fact better authenticated than this. Hist. Bap. p. 85.

I suppose this testimony will be good among Baptists, as Robinson was an able Baptist writer. Again, Dr. Wall, an able English writer, confirms the above statement of the customs of the church in the second century, as any one may see by consulting his Hist. of Inft. Bap. pp. 417–18–19–20; vol. 2.

Now let us admit, for the sake of argument, that Baptists are right when they contend, that the primitive church represents to us the true apostolical pattern. Then, according to their own showing, it will follow, that John the Baptist and the apostles baptized men and women naked—that they dipped them three times—that they marked them with the sign of the cross—that they gave them milk and honey to drink—that they clothed them in white garments —that they used unction upon them, and that they baptized

infants ; (for there is no historical fact better established than that the primitive church baptized infants, as I will show hereafter ;) and of course the Baptist church, to be consistent, ought to go and do likewise, for we find all these things in the original pattern, which she has laid down to govern us. But my Baptist brethren will object to my pushing their own argument to its proper results, and beg to be excused. But I hold them to their own principles. If the church in the second century gives us the true apostolical pattern of baptism, as they contend, I hold them to that pattern in all its parts. One of their own able writers, Mr. Broaddus of Virginia, says :—*Unless the plan laid down in the* PATTERN *is implicitly pursued, the thing required is not performed at all.*" Slicer on Bap. p. 156. Then, brethren, be consistent and stick to your pattern ; for if antiquity pleads for immersion, it equally pleads for all these, its ancient accompaniments ; for they are contained in the very first authentic historical accounts of immersion. But no. In this, as in many other cases, they will be inconsistent. In practice they contradict their own argument, and swerve from their own pattern.

The fact is, no one can believe that the apostles used all the foolish mummeries in baptism, which we find accompanying immersion in the second century. Upon what ground then can it be inferred, that the baptism of the apostles was the immersion of this century ? In this century we find *immersion* in bad company—such company as never attended *baptism* in the days of the apostles. If then all the senseless accompaniments, which we find attending immersion in the second century, were innovations, what assurance have we, that they did not innovate upon the mode of baptism too ? and all to make the rite more imposing. Be this as it may, one thing, at least, is certain. The very first historical account we have of immersion is, that it goes hand in hand with several very superstitious innovations ; and our Baptist brethren are certainly welcome to all the advantage that such a circumstance will afford them.

But there is another item in this pattern that I wish to bring to the consideration of the reader. The primitive Church used sprinkling and pouring as well as immersion, and considered them as valid modes of baptism. This is abundantly proved by many authors, but at present I will only quote from Dr. Wall. Speaking of baptism in the second century, he says : " In case of sickness, weakliness, haste, want of sufficient quantity of water, or such like extraordinary circumstances, baptism by affusion of water

on the face was by the ancients counted sufficient baptism." Wall says: of the above, there are many proofs, two or three of which he instances. He mentions the case of Novatian, who turned Christian but little above one hundred years after the time of the apostles. He was baptized by sprinkling or pouring, and St. Cyprian judged it to be valid. He also mentions the case of a soldier who had engaged to be one of the executioners of St. Lawrence. This soldier professed to be converted and brought a pitcher of water, that he might receive baptism at the hand of the martyr, at the place of execution. Wall's Hist. Inft. Bap. 2 vol. pp. 385.–86–87–88. And Wal. Strabo De Rebus Ecclesiast. cap. 26, as quoted by Wall.

I need not introduce other testimony on this point, for Mr. F. has saved me the trouble, by bringing forward the testimony of some eight or ten credible witnesses, all going to prove the same thing. But he would have us believe that the ancient church used sprinkling and pouring because they believed baptism essential to salvation, yet among all his witnesses there is but one that mentions any such thing, and that is Van Coellen; and he does not say they held it to be indispensably essential. But let it be as Mr. F. likes. Let it be granted that the primitive church did believe, that water baptism was indispensably essential to salvation, and this may readily account for their common practice of immersion; for when people become so heterodox as to attribute such virtue to water, it is very natural for them to conclude that the use of a great deal of it is better than the use of a little. And if we might judge from the great zeal of immersionists of the present day, to make proselytes to their exclusive system, we should at once conclude that the same notion still exists among them; for they, both ministers and members, often unsettle the minds of young Christians in other churches, by trying to make them believe, that immersion, by a regularly authorized immerser, is the only right way, and that they are unsafe without it. But, be this as it may; the question is, did the ancient church count pouring and sprinkling as sufficient? That they did, no man who is wise will deny. Then will our Baptist brethren respect the pattern, to which they themselves have pointed as correct, and in case of sickness, haste, want of quantity of water, &c., use pouring and sprinkling, as the ancients did, when immersion was impracticable? They will not. Though a man should obtain religion while lingering on his death bed, and desire baptism, that he might be brought regularly into the christian church, and receive the holy communion before his death;

all this they will deny him, if his condition is such as to preclude immersion, and suffer him to die without baptism, without reception into the church, and without the holy sacrament. Such a case I once knew: and can that system be correct, which thus rigidly confines every thing to a mere outward rite, and deprives a dying man of those privileges which are dearer to him than all the world besides? I leave the candid reader to judge.

II. I notice, secondly, the Baptist argument founded on the meaning of the Greek verb Βαπτιζω, (baptizo.) The argument runs thus: This verb, wherever it occurs, whether in classic or sacred usage, means to immerse, and that only; and that it is the only word which occurs in the whole of the New Testament wherever baptism is spoken of; and therefore immersion is the only allowable mode of baptism, and that, "all true criticism, all true learning are in favor of immersion." Mr. Furman "*of Cheraw*," is very bold in these assertions; for he declares, that he, both in Cheraw and at Cedar Creek, stood up and challenged the world to prove the contrary. Sermon pp. 4, 8.

Although in his sermon at Cedar Creek, he compared himself to little David, with his "pebble and sling of truth," yet this smacks very strongly of the empty vauntings of the uncircumcised Goliath. But let us bring his dogmatical assertions to the test of truth, and see if there is any cause for such vaporing.

First: He asserts that "all true criticism, all true learning *is* in favor of immersion" That is, of course, declaring that all true learning and criticism are in favour of the Baptist dogma of exclusive immersion; for we have never denied that immersion is one of the valid modes of baptism. Then, is the declaration of Mr. F. that "all true criticism, all true learning" are in his favour true? There are the M. E. Church in this country, and the Wesleyan connection in England, the Presbyterian and Protestant Episcopal churches both in England and America, the Dutch Reformed, Moravian, Lutheran, and many other churches, all of which can boast of their hundreds and thousands of the most learned men that ever graced the world, and it is the fact, even now, that members of Pædobaptist churches fill almost all the high places of learning both in Europe and in America. Then I ask: among all these is there no "true criticism, no true learning?" Is all "true learning" confined to those who favour the Baptist notion of immersion? For it comes to this at last. Let Mr. F. twist and shuffle as he may, it comes to this, according to his declaration, that "all true criticism,"

and all "true learning," are concentrated in the Baptist church. But almost all the enlightened world,—aye all,—rise up in contradiction of the arrogant assumption. Then, as Mr. F. has challenged the world, he has the world against him on this point. Reader, did you ever see the poetical account of "the critic fly" that sat upon a well-proportioned dome, and while his feeble ray extended scarce an inch around, he dared to tax the structure of the whole? *Mr. Furman against the world!* Rather a Quixotic tilt.

As Mr. F. has claimed that "all true criticism, and all true learning" are on his side of the question, so some of the members of his communion in this part of the country, have seemed to be trying to screw themselves up to the realization of the claim. If you mention the subject of baptism in some circles, you will have the Greek showered down upon you without stint or mercy. Βαπτιζω (baptizo) and the Greek prepositions, these are the battle-words of these modern wiseacres, who, in Greek Literature, have tried to force themselves into medias res in short order; and who, by their crude effusions and passionate lucubrations, almost astonish the natives; when, at the same time, those who are most infected with the Greek mania, could not construe correctly and translate ten lines in any part of Jacob's Greek Reader. This way of arriving at superiority in literature, by a kind of magic, I never could understand. But let our brethren enjoy all the glory of their imaginary superiority as long as they can; for I venture to say, that if ever the true light of science fully dawns upon their minds, and dispels their mental chaos, so as to enable them to find their true position as to the hill of science, the day-dream will vanish; the hallucination, with all its fantastic glories, will be dispelled, and they will then know what the poet meant when he said:

> "A little learning is a dangerous thing,
> Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring,
> There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
> But drinking largely sobers us again."

Secondly: Mr. Furman says that the Greek verb Βαπτιζω (baptizo) "means only to immerse,"—that "wherever it occurs, it means, without a solitary exception, nothing more and nothing less than immersion." His sermons of 1840 and 1843, p. 4 & p. 11.

We here take issue with him, and as he has appealed to several Greek lexicons, we will go with him to that source, and refute him by his own witnesses.

Schrevelius says: Βαπτιζω (baptizo) means baptizo, mergo, abluo, lavo. Here Schrevelius gives to the verb four mean-

ings. Now if it only means to immerse, as Mr. F. says, Schrevelius is guilty of a fourfold tautology, for he renders the Greek verb by four Latin verbs. Now if they all mean to immerse, then we would have Schrevelius saying that βαπτιζω means to immerse—to immerse—to immerse—to immerse. Can any man in his sober senses charge such tautology upon a learned lexicographer? The fact is Schrevelius knew that immersion was not its only meaning, or he would have said that and no more. But let us notice particularly the meanings which are given to this Greek verb, as above seen. The first is:—*baptizo*, to baptize. Secondly:—*Mergo*, to immerse. Thirdly:—*Abluo*, to wash away, to wash clean, to purify. Fourthly:—*Lavo*, to wash, to rinse, to besprinkle. These meanings are given to *Abluo* and *Lavo* by Ainsworth, the celebrated Latin lexicographer. Now let the reader take notice, that Schrevelius says that one meaning of this Greek verb—βαπτιζω—is *Lavo*—a Latin verb; and that Ainsworth's Latin dictionary says, that this Latin verb *Lavo*, means, to wash, to rinse, to besprinkle. Then, in spite of Mr. Furman, we get washing, rinsing, purifying and sprinkling out of his Greek verb. As to sprinkling there is no immersion in that, and washing and rinsing do not necessarily imply immersion; for we daily and almost hourly wash our faces, hands, bodies, and rinse or wash our vessels, &c. &c. without immersing them. As to purifying; that, without any reference to mode, is, doubtless, the proper meaning of baptism, as we shall hereafter show. I cannot close my remarks on the definitions of Schrevelius, without reminding the reader, that at last, he says, that the English of baptizo is, to baptize. Let Mr. F. call it Greek transferred, or what he may, yet this learned lexicographer says that the Greek verb in question, means in English, to baptize, and not to immerse. Then his testimony on this point, so for as it goes, is, that no one particular mode is essential to baptism.

Groves. "βαπτιζω, to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize, to depress, humble, overwhelm." "βαπτισομαι, to wash one's self, to bathe, to sink, to faint, to be dejected." In the above definitions we find several meanings besides that of immersion, "as to wash, cleanse, purify,"—all of which may be performed, and are generally performed without immersion. Another meaning is "to faint." Does this imply immersion? Yes, says Mr. F., it implies it figuratively; for he is determined to see immersion, and nothing but immersion, in all the meanings of this Greek verb. Well, we common folks, that look upon things in a common sense way, will have to borrow

Mr. Furman's baptismal eye-glasses, before we can see how fainting, either literally or figuratively, can imply a total immersion in a creek, river, or tank. Again: it is worthy of remark, that Groves, after giving to the verb in question several meanings which imply immersion, and several others which do not ordinarily imply immersion, then gives the meaning "to baptize." Now, if to immerse and to baptize mean one and the same thing, why did he pursue this method? No good reason can be given in answer. What, then, are we to infer from the definitions of Groves, and the manner in which he gives those definitions? Why, simply this: that the Greek verb in question signifies, first, to immerse. Secondly, to wash, cleanse or purify, either with or without immersion, and, as experience teaches us, ordinarily without it. Thirdly: *to baptize*, without reference to any particular mode.

Donnegan. βαπτιζω, to immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge, to soak thoroughly, to saturate; hence to drench with wine, *wet*, to confound totally, to dip in a vessel and draw. Here again are several meanings, some of which signify immersion while others do not; for it would be difficult to understand how "drenching one with wine" signifies to immerse him in it.

Robinson. βαπτιζω, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, to baptize, immerse, administer the rite of baptism, &c.

The primary meaning which Robinson gives to the verb is to wash or cleanse, without any reference to mode.

Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon: ϐαπτιζω, to dip, immerse, or plunge in water. But, says Parkhurst, "in the New-Testament it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included" in its meaning, *to wash, to baptize, to wash with water in token of purification from sin and from spiritual pollution.*

Then the testimony of Parkhurst is, that in the New-Testament, it does not strictly mean to immerse, but to wash, cleanse, &c., without reference to any particular mode, or, at least, that this washing with water, cleansing or baptising may be performed either with or without immersion.

Greenfield's Lexicon to the New-Testament: ϐαπτιζω, in New-Testament to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, immerse, baptize, administer the rite of baptism.

Translation of the article on the word ϐαπτιζω in Passow's Lexicon. To immerse often and repeatedly, to submerge. *Hence to moisten, sprinkle, water, wet or bathe,* οι ϐεϐαπτισμενοι (oi bebaptismenoi) the drunken, those who have soaked themselves, *vino madidi,* Plato. To *pour upon, to spill, to overwhelm, to heap upon,* εισφοραις οφλημασι ϐεϐαπτισμενος,—over-

whelmed with taxes, with debts: μειραχιον βαπτισομενον, a boy overwhelmed with questions. Plato, Euthyd. p. 277. *To sink, dip, or fill a bucket.* Plut.

Thus I have consulted seven Greek Lexicons, four of which Mr. Furman has quoted, and not one of them will sustain him in his position that baptizo means only to immerse; and to prove it beyond all contradiction, I call in Dr. Carson, the great Baptist oracle. He takes the same position with Mr. Furman, yet he acknowledges that "all the lexicographers and commentators are against him in this opinion." Carson & Cox on Baptism, p. 79.

Then see how these doctors differ. They both take the same position, and Mr. F. brings up four Greek lexicographers to prove that they are right; but Dr. Carson, who has a little more discernment, says, that "all lexicographers and commentators" are against them. Dr. Carson was certainly chivalrous in taking a position against such fearful odds, but Mr. F. has gone quite a step beyond him; for he takes the same position, and challenges the world to show the contrary; and in bringing up the evidence to support that position, he even puts the great Dr. Carson at defiance; and farther, he puts common sense and the intelligence of the public at defiance, and attempts to make people believe that Greek lexicographers sustain him, when every one that he introduces most positively condemns him. Does Mr. F. think that the people are so infatuated, as to receive implicitly, without discernment or investigation, any thing that he may say? Does he really believe that his readers will take it for granted, that baptizo means only to immerse, when the very lexicons which he himself has brought forward, say it means several other things?

But he says that these lexicographers speak of immersion as "the primary meaning of baptizo"—that "they indeed speak of washing, cleansing, and purifying. But this is only in a secondary sense, and only as a consequence of immersion." Sermon, p. 5.

Then it seems that this Greek verb has a "primary" and a "secondary" meaning. But how does this accord with Mr. F.'s main position—that it has but one meaning, and that is to immerse? This, says Mr. F., is easily explained. When it means to wash, cleanse, or purify, it is only as a consequence of immersion. But where is the evidence of it? The lexicograhers do not say so. Neither does common understanding or experience say so. Every body knows that immersion is not ordinarily necessary to washing, cleansing, or purifying, and that washing, cleansing, or purifying, are not necessary consequences of im-

mersion; for there are thousands of immersions where there is no washing, cleansing, or purifying; and thousands of instances of washing, cleansing, or purifying, where there is no immersion.

Again: on the same page Mr. F. says:

"βαπτιζω does not refer to the cleansing or purifying process, but it refers entirely to the mode."

A proposition more at war with all propriety, and with all our established notions, than the above, could not well be conceived. To show its absurdity, I would simply ask: which is of the more importance, the thing to be done, or the mode or manner of doing it? All common sense would answer at once, that the thing to be done is the prime consideration, and that there is no worth in mode, any farther than economy is concerned. But Mr. F. merges every thing into *the mode*. He is emphatically the *man of mode*; for he says, that "mode is every thing." He admits that baptizo sometimes means, to wash, cleanse, or purify, but these are only given as "consequences of immersion;" and that when baptizo has these meanings "it does not refer to the cleansing or purifying process, but it refers entirely to the mode." Well, let us test the practical operation of this very strange position. Mr. F. says to his servant, take this handkerchief and baptize, wash, cleanse or purify it. The servant takes it and dips it into a vessel of water, and carries it to him. He exclaims, did I not tell you to wash or cleanse it? And yet you have brought it to me only wet, and as filthy as ever. Truly, sir, says the servant; but then you teach, that the verb which contains the command, "does not refer to the cleansing or purifying process, but it refers entirely to the mode," and that the mode is immersion. Then I have obeyed your command, according to your own interpretation of its meaning. Mr. F., if consistent, could say nothing in reply, but would be compelled to take and use his uncleansed handkerchief, as the result of his own incorrect doctrine.

Again: a mother says to her nurse, take this child, and baptize, wash or cleanse his hands, face and feet. Mr. F., who is standing by, explains to the servant thus: your mistress does not mean that you shall wash or cleanse the dirt from the face, hands and feet of the child, for the word of command which she uses "does not refer to the cleansing or purifying process, but it refers entirely to mode," and the mode is immersion. The servant goes and dips the face, hands and feet of the child into water, and brings it to its mother in worse plight than before. Is there a mother in

all the land that would submit to the practical operation of Mr. Furman's doctrine? But hold, Mr. F. "Do not cry out "*childish quibbling!* "*superlatively ridiculous!!*" For these are but the natural results of your own heterodoxy. But you reply, that on the same page of your sermon, from which the above quotation is taken, you have also said, that, "when an object is washed or cleansed by being dipped or immersed, baptizo is used." But this is nothing to the purpose; for you have already said, that this verb refers entirely to the mode, and not to the cleansing or purifying process; then, where is the word that expresses the washing or cleansing in such sentences, if baptizo does not? But you will say farther, that when an "object is washed by sprinkling or pouring, or in any other way, baptizo is never used." Same page. Nay, sir, I am compelled to tell you, in reply, that your declaration is incorrect, for in Luke ii. 38, and Mark vii. 4, baptizo is used for washing, cleansing or purifying, when immersion is out of the question, as I shall show hereafter. Then my position, in reference to the foregoing senses of baptizo, to wash, cleanse, &c., is this: if I command an article to be cleansed or washed, I do not command it to be dipped or sprinkled. I enjoin nothing as to mode. I only require a certain *effect* to be produced, leaving the *mode* entirely to the force of discretion and circumstances. So that whether the cleansing be done by dipping, sprinkling, or pouring water upon the article, is of no importance. Let it be done by any mode, and the command is obeyed, although baptizo *is* used in giving the command. Then, Mr. F. and Pædo-baptists are diametrically at issue here. He says that "mode is every thing" when baptizo is used. They say that mode is of no importance any farther than economy is concerned. I am willing even for common sense to decide between them.

In searching farther after the true meaning of βαπτιζω (baptizo), I remark that it is derived from βαπτω—(bapto) which is its root or theme; and in tracing out the etymology and true meaning of any word, that philological connection which exists between a word and its primitive, must always be observed. Then, by the laws of etymology, bapto has a philological bearing in fixing the meaning of baptizo. What then, is the meaning of bapto? According to lexicographers in general, bapto means to dip, to moisten or wet, to stain, dye, &c. The learned Dr. Gale, a distinguished Baptist writer of England, in his reflections on Wall's History of infant baptism, says, that these verbs "are exactly the same as to signification." This is

granting more than we ask. All that we contend for on this point is, that as baptizo branches out from its primitive bapto, it acquires different shades of meaning, and implies, at least, as many applications of water as its primitive.

Dr. Carson, the learned Baptist author, of Edinburgh, very nearly agrees with Dr. Gale. He says:

"As to *totality of immersion*, the one" (Greek verb) "is perfectly equivalent to the other." Carson & Cox on Bap. p. 20.

Again—"bapto, the root, I have shown to possess two meanings, to dip and to dye. Baptizo, I have asserted has but one signification. It has been formed on the idea of the primary meaning of the root, and has never admitted the secondary." Ibid. p. 79.

Then, according to Dr. Carson, baptizo is perfectly coincident in meaning, with the primary meaning of bapto. So far as mode is concerned. That is, when bapto does not mean "to dye," it means just what baptizo means. Now, if it can be proved that bapto does not always mean "to dip," when it is not used for dying, then, according to Dr. Carson, baptizo does not always mean to immerse. Among the many passages which might be cited to prove that bapto does not always mean to immerse, I will only mention one in point. This may be found in the book of Dan. v. 21. The words of the Septuagint are —απο της δροσου του ουρανου το σωμα αυτου εβαφη—(apo tés droson ton ouranou to sóma autou ebaphé.) Translation: "His body was wet with the dew of heaven." Here bapto is used to express only a wetting, moistening, or sprinkling of the body of Nebuchadnezzar with the dew of heaven. Then, of course, baptizo does not always mean to immerse.

Dr. Carson saw this difficulty rising up in the way of his system, and he labours hard, through several pages, to prove that Nebuchadnezzar was immersed in the dew, but all to no effect. He is like a strong man struggling in a morass. Every effort he makes to extricate himself, but sinks him deeper.

After having consulted several Greek lexicons, which, I suppose, do not speak much to his liking, Mr. F. appeals to the Greek language, and brings forward, from different authors, several quotations, in which baptizo means to immerse, and then, as if he had accomplished some vast achievement, whose glory would dazzle the world, and shine all opposition into profound insignificance, he exclaims:—

"How supremely ridiculous it would be to speak of sprinkling a ship into the sea, or sprinkling an arrow into

the river, or sprinkling a piece of red hot iron into the water, or sprinkling a man into a lake, or into a river!" Aye "how supremely ridiculous!!" But, who but Mr. Furman "*of Cheraw*" ever thought of such a thing? Here is a bright scintillation from his glowing genius—an almost ineffable conception—a brilliant and felicitous idea, at which the world may pause and wonder. Surely he is entitled to all the honour of originality in this matter, and I will not presume to mar that honour, by attempting a formal reply to this surpassing effusion. But, I would ask, what has Mr. F. gained, when he has proved that baptizo means to immerse in the quotations which he has taken from Greek classics? Why, just nothing at all; for nobody ever denied that it means to immerse. The question in issue is; does it have any other meaning? We say that it has, and also appeal to the language for farther proof.

Plato, Coviv, p. 176. "*I, myself, am one of those who were drenched or made drunk* (βεβαπτισμενων) *yesterday*," viz., with wine. Now it would be difficult to conceive how any one can be said to be immersed in the wine which he swallows, or with which he is drenched. Again:

Euthydem. p. 277. ed. Heindorf. A youth overwhelmed—(βαπτιζομενον)—*baptizomenon*—with qestions. Again, it would be difficult to conceive how a youth could be plunged or immersed into a parcel of questions.

Diodorus Siculus. Tom. i. p. 129. *And because they* (the nobles) *have a supply by these means* (presents,) *they do not oppress* (βαπτιζουσι) their subjects with taxes. Here baptizo does not signify to dip or immerse, for people cannot be dipped into taxes.

Plutarch Tom. vi. p. 30. *The soul is nourished by moderate labour, but is overwhelmed or fatigued* (βαπτιζεται) *by excessive ones.* Here baptizo is used to express that fatigue or giving way of the mind, which is produced by excessive labour.

Origen, in his *comment. in Joann.* Tom. vii., p. 116 as quoted by Wall, in Hist. of Inft. Bap. vol. ii. p. 331–2, in speaking of the pouring of water upon the sacrifice and altar, which Elijah prepared in the presence of Ahab, &c., as related in the xviii. of 1 Kings, calls that pouring a baptism, and uses baptizo to express the action of that pouring. Then, here is Origen, one of the most learned of the early fathers, who uses baptizo to express the pouring of water upon an altar. This is proof as plain and as much to the point as proof can be, to show that baptizo does not always mean to immerse.

Quotations like the above might be numerously taken from the Greek classics, but I consider them in a great degree irrelevant. Why should we go to the ancient Greeks to learn the revelation of God? They were heathens, and never saw or read the Bible. From them I turn away, and go to the scriptures of truth, as to a complete revelation from God, containing everything which is necessary for our faith and practice, and fully explaining themselves to all the intents and purposes of man's salvation, without the intervention of heathen Greeks.

There is undoubtedly a difference between the classic and scriptural usus loquendi of βαπτιζω. That is, "between the classic Greek, or the writings of those Greek authors who were educated in the philosophy and doctrines of heathenism: and Hebraistic Greek, or those books which were written in Greek by Jews, who had been educated in the doctrines of the Bible; and who, though they spoke in the Greek language, yet thought as Jews, or Christians. Aristotle would naturally express the ideas of a heathen in Greek words; but St. John would as naturally express, in Greek, the ideas peculiar to a Jew converted to Christianity. Hebraistic Greek is, therefore, nothing else than Hebrew ideas expressed in Greek words. The doctrines of Christianity could never have been expressed in Greek, as they have been, without altering the meaning of many words. The reason is obvious. The Greeks never had any conception of many of the doctrines of Christianity, and, consequently, had no words in their language primarily adapted to express them. Wherever, therefore, the New Testament differs from the notions of the heathen; wherever Christianity becomes peculiar to itself—*sui generis*—if some circumlocution of the pliant Greek be not employed; we may look for a change in the meaning of words, corresponding to these new opinions, and we must then appeal to the usuage of the New Testament, and not to that of the classics.

"It seems not to have been sufficiently considered that when a word is used purely in a religious sense, or to denote a religious rite, that it is likely to assume a meaning different from that which it bears in common use. Who can believe that our Lord meant to attach no higher sense to baptizo, when he said to the disciples, 'Teach all nations, baptizing them,' &c., than Josephus did, when he spoke of his shipwreck, and the vessel in which he was sailing being *baptized* or *sinking* (βαπτισθεντος,) in the Adriatic sea?"

The above very correct views of Mr. Hibbard, are con-

firmed by the able testimony of professor Robinson of New York, as given in the American Biblical Repository for April, 1841.

Our chief enquiry then, should be—what is the scriptural meaning of baptizo, when used in a religious or ritual sense?

1. Isa. xxi. 4. My heart panted, fearfulness affrighted me—(με βαπτιζει). Here baptizo, according to the translators, means to affright. This agrees with the Hebrew of the verse. Others may say it means to overwhelm. Be that as it may, it will be hard to get immerse out of it. How would it sound to say, fearfulness immersed me?

2. The only place where baptizo is used in the Old Testament, as I now recollect, is in 2 Kings, v. 14, where Naaman is said to have "dipped" or baptized himself seven times in the river Jordan. Upon this Mr. F. lays considerable stress, as affording a clear case of immersion. And indeed this case is as favourable to the idea of immersion, as any other in the Bible, where baptizo is used, and yet it is not positively certain that Naaman immersed himself, for the following reasons.

1. The prophet in giving the direction to Naaman, uses the verb λουω—(louo)—which signifies primarily *to wash*. The direction is—λουσαι εν τω Ιορδανη—wash in the Jordan, or with the Jordan; i. e. with the waters of the Jordan. Now, did Naaman understand and obey the command of the prophet? If he did, then all that we can infer is, that he washed, &c. And εβαπτισατω εν τω Ιορδανη in the 14th verse, which is translated—"he dipped himself in Jordan," may as well, and probably better, be translated—he washed himself in the Jordan, or with the waters of the Jordan; for baptizo which is here used to express the action of Naaman, frequently means to wash; and in this case, its meaning must be synonymous with that of λουω,—(louo) which contains the direction given by the prophet, and which, as before said, primarily means to wash. Again: the Greek of the 14th verse, which expresses the action of Naaman, is not a good expression for dipping or immerging, as every Greek scholar knows; for τω Ιορδανη is in the dative case—a case which denotes the cause, manner, and instrument, or the place, &c., at which a thing is performed, and not the element into which a person or thing is immersed.

2. The law for the cleansing of lepers, as given in the xiv. 7 of Leviticus, prescribes that they shall be sprinkled seven times, &c. Now Naaman was a leper, and the prophet knew the law; the strong probability then

is, that Elisha gave to Naaman the *legal* direction, leaving out all but the washing or sprinkling, and that Naaman *legally* obeyed it.

3. Luke xi. 38. "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner." In the original, εβαπτισθε—(ebaptisthe)—is used for "washed." This verb is one of the forms of baptizo. Does this verb here mean to immerse, and was the Pharisee astonished because Christ did not plunge his whole body into water before dinner? Was this custom so prevalent, that the neglect of it in a single instance, was matter of astonishment? There is no evidence—not the least, of any such thing; and none have ever pretended to think so, except those who are determined to resolve every thing into immersion. The Pharisees washed their hands before eating, and it was the neglect of this that caused the Pharisee to marvel. According to the best evidence, this washing of the hands was performed by having water poured on them by a servant, and baptizo is used to express this washing, therefore, it cannot here mean to immerse.

4. Mark vii. 4. "And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not:" με βαπτιζωνται—(me baptizontai) is the Greek expression for—"except they wash." Here baptizo is used to express a washing, where, according to reason and all historical evidence in the matter, immersion is out of the question; for who can believe that the Pharisees plunged their whole bodies into water every time they came from market? In the latter part of the same verse it is said: "and many other things there be which they hold, such as the washing (βαπτισμους) of cups, pots, brazen vessels and tables." In washing their cups, pots, &c., they may have immersed them, or they may not. And whether they did or not is utterly unimportant, for the ceremonial purification was their principal object, and not the mode by which it was performed. But that they, in these ceremonial washings, immersed their tables or couches, is a proposition at war with our reason, and with all our notions of propriety, and which has nothing to support it, either in sacred or profane history. And yet Mr. Furman's untenable and strange position, relative to the meaning of the verb baptizo, drives him to the stranger position, that immersion was the custom in all these instances. That is, that the Pharisee marvelled because Christ did not immerse himself before eating—that they invariably immersed themselves as often as they came from market—and that they ceremonially immersed their tables, couches, or beds. The task is a hard one, but yet Mr. F.

has to screw himself up to it, in order to maintain his ecclesiastico-dipping consistency.

In Mark vii. 3, νιπτω (nipto) is used for the washing of the hands, and in the 4th verse, baptizo is used to express that washing which the Pharisees used when they came from the market. From hence Mr. F. argues thus:—"The word first used here is *nipto* to wash by rinsing or pouring; the second is *baptizo*, to wash by bathing or immersing. The former is confined to washing the hands—the latter seems to refer to the bathing or immersion of the whole body."

As to the meaning of nipto, Mr. F. is, as usual, incorrect; for its meaning is not confined to the washing of the hands," as any one may see by examining. In these Jewish lustrations, or purifications, it is used, at least in some instances, to express the same meaning as baptizo. For example. What washing was that spoken of, Luke xi. 38, the neglect of which, by Christ, caused the Pharisee to marvel? Surely it was that washing so common among the Pharisees—the washing of the hands before eating. The same washing that is spoken of in Mark vii. 3. Well, in the one case nipto is used to express the washing, and in the other, baptizo is used. Now if the washings are the same, which I think none can doubt, then nipto and baptizo are used interchangeably, the one for the other, to express one and the same kind of washing, which, as Mr. F. says, was done by rinsing or pouring.

But, says Mr. F., baptizo in the above passages, means "to wash by bathing or immersing." p. 21. This is a mere assumption of Mr. F., which neither he, nor any advocate of his system has ever proved. But he modifies a little, and on the same page says: it seems to refer to the bathing or immersion of the whole body." It "seems!" Then I suppose that whatever "*seems*" to Mr. F. to be thus or so, is to be taken as purely orthodox. Really this is a knock-down argument. It "*seems*" to Mr. F. to be so, and therefore it must be so. I might safely say in reply, that it "*seems*" to me to be different; and this *seeming* argument of mine, is certainly stronger than his; for I have set up no standard with a determination of bending every thing thereto, but it "*seems*" that Mr. F. has. I look at the verses in question through the medium of a liberal and fair construction; he looks at them through a pair of watery eye-glasses, which are well calculated to distort, and which will permit him to see nothing in any verse where baptizo is used, except much water and plunging.

On the same page, Mr. F. gives what he calls "the tes-

timony of Maimonides" as quoted by Dr. Lightfoot in his Com. on Mat. iii. 6." Wheresover in the law, washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else than washing of the whole body." This testimony of the learned Jew is nothing to the purpose; for unfortunately for Mr. F. there is no washing of the body or clothes, as such, mentioned in the passages of scripture in question.

"That baptizo does not bear the sense of immerse in Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, is evident from the following considerations."

1. "The character and frequency of these purifications render it impossible that they were effected by immersing the whole body in water. It must be remembered that these baptisms were performed always before eating, and after returning from market. The Jews ate three times a day. How often they returned from market we know not. The market, among the Greeks and Romans, and also among the Jews, after they had copied the manners of those nations to some extent, was a place of resort for those who wished to trade—for philosophers to teach wisdom—for magistrates to administer justice—for poets, dramatists, and actors to amuse the people—and for the unemployed, &c. Hence we find Paul disputing with philosophers in the market, and Paul and Silas accused before the magistrate in the market-place. Acts xvii. 17 and xvi. 19. Hence the Pharisees 'loved salutations in the market-places.' Mark xii. 38. Hence their visits to the market were not casual, but frequent and necessary." Now, did they immerse themselves every time they ate, and, in addition to that, every time they returned from market? Were they thus, in all seasons of the year, running to the bath several times every day and plunging themselves into the water? Such a supposition would involve an amount of inconvenience and loss of time, which, to a mind unbiassed by prejudice, would ever be an insuperable argument against the system of our opponents.

2. "Besides, it being clear that they baptized themselves for a religious, and not for a common, purpose, it becomes still more improbable that they immersed on those occasions, from the fact that their clothes would need to be submerged in water equally with their bodies. According to Jewish laws and notions of legal defilement, whatever operated to defile the person, tended equally to defile all the clothes which he had on at the time; and the clothes, under such circumstances, needed to be purified equally with the man himself. If the Pharisees, then, on account of their high notions of legal sanctity, immersed their

bodies in water on returning from market, and before eating, they must also have submerged their clothes in water, or the touch of their garments would have rendered them still unclean. But who can believe that they were in any such habit of plunging their bodies and clothes several times every day? Such a habit would have been utterly incompatible with the condition of the common or poorer class of society, which, doubtless, constituted the great majority. They could not have kept on hand, for themselves and their families, the necessary changes of raiment for such frequent immersions; for they must have changed their clothing every time they immersed, or their clothes and bodies must have been constantly wet. In this way they could not have lived, unless they acquired an amphibious nature by their constant immersions. Let him believe such a thing who can; but no one will believe it, except those who have a favorite system to serve.

3. "In Mat. ii. 6, a circumstance is related which explains and corroborates the above views. We there read, 'There were set six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins each.' Now what was the 'purifying of the Jews,' here spoken of? All will admit that this purifying consisted in those daily 'washings' spoken of in Mark vii. 3, 4, and Luke xi. 38, &c. Well, these water-pots were used for these very occasions of washing or purifying, and, according to the most favorable accounts, they were not half large enough for the purpose of immersion." Then what becomes of Mr. Furman's idea of immersion on all these occasions? "It is manifestly improbable, if not absurd and impossible."

4. "Kuinoel on Mark vii. 4, well remarks that the existence of any such custom of regular immersion before all meals cannot be proved. And the opinions and statements of Jewish writers in after ages are of very little weight." President Beecher on baptizo, quoted by Hibbard.

Other arguments might be adduced to show that baptizo in the above passages, cannot mean to immerse the whole body, as Mr. F. and others contend, but enough has been said to convince all that are convincible.

There is one other text in the New Testament in which baptizo is used, where immersion is out of the question. It is in 1 Cor. x. 2, "And were all baptized, ἐβαπτίσαντο (ebaptisanto) unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Here baptizo is used when there could have been no immersion. They were not plunged into the sea, which stood up as a wall on either hand; for they went over dry-shod. They were not immersed in the cloud, for that was above them

or rather behind them. And yet they were baptized. Surely, then, it was by a sprinkling from the cloud, as it passed to their rear, and the spray of the sea. As I shall have occasion to advert to this circumstance again, I will remark no more upon it at present.

But why be so careful to prove that baptizo in Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, does not imply the immersion of the whole body, when celebrated Baptist authors are not agreed among themselves in this matter? Mr. Woolsey, an able Baptist writer, says, page 158: "*There is not sufficient ground for believing that the Jews immersed their whole body when they returned from market.*" And he mentions the Jewish custom of using water-pots, as above alluded to, as proof conclusive that he is right; for, says he, these water-pots, at most, held only twelve or thirteen gallons, and it is impossible that the immersion of the body could have taken place in them. Mr. Campbell comes to the aid of Mr. Woolsey in these views. But Judd and Carson, two eminent Baptist authors, take the ground that the immersion of the whole body was the uniform custom in all these instances. Woolsey and Campbell, by a kind of circumlocution and addition, make the passages mean, that they dipped their hands into a little water. That the immersion is predicated of the hands. But Carson and Judd, knowing that "hands" cannot be pressed into Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38, without altering, and adding to the diction of the Holy Ghost, reject the scheme of Woolsey and Campbell; and Carson calls it, "nothing but an ingenious *device*, without any authority from the genius and practice of the language." But hark! The Baptist church claims that "to them is committed *the sole guardianship of pure and faithful translations of the oracles of God into the languages of the earth.*"*

Then I go to the door of the Baptist Church—this divinely appointed guardian "*of faithful and pure translations of the oracles of God*," and ask: Brethren, how am I to understand Mark vii. 4, and Luke xi. 38. If the response shall be; that baptizo in these passages means to immerse the whole body; then the brethren on my right—Woolsey and Campbell, will exclaim, not so! This is making the word of God speak falsehood. "*There is not sufficient ground for believing that the Jews immersed their whole body when returning from market.*" But if the response shall be, that baptizo here means the immersion of the hands in a little water; then Carson, Judd, and Furman on my left—three very knowing ones among these

* Am. and For. Bible Soc. Report, 1840. p. 79.

modern guardians of the oracles of God, will reply. Not so! This is "nothing but an ingenious *device*, without any authority from the genius and practice of the language." Thus by the sword of the brethren, either on my right hand, or on my left, I am completely cut off from an answer; and I stand contemplating the contest that is going on in this house divided against itself, until each party is beaten and the conflict somewhat abates; for both occupy untenable ground. I then go in and say; brethren; for the sake of religion and consistency, cease fighting. It does not become the *only* guardians and conservators of God's pure word, thus to be contending among yourselves. The truth is between you. Baptizo, in the above passages, means to cleanse or purify without any reference to mode. This is reasonable and scriptural ground, upon which you may safely meet, and sheathe your swords.

Our baptist brethren require too much of this Greek verb. They will not be content unless it will always afford water enough for immersion. When it seems to be obstinate, they put it under a *squeezing* process. Thus they have *squeezed* it through almost all the Greek classics, and affect to be pretty well satisfied with the process. Although, at times, it gives them much trouble; for in some instances, after all their *squeezing*, it obstinately refuses to give out the quantum suf. of water; yet in these instances they content themselves by saying, that it answers *figuratively*. But when they come to the New Testament, this verb is entirely *too dry* for them. Hence they put it under the cogs and levers of high-pressure power, and ply it with all their prowess. But its *dry* obstinacy is more than a match for all their efforts. It will not be *pressed* into the service of their exclusive dipping dogma.

Our Baptist brethren next appeal to the practice of the Greek Church, and argue, that as the Greeks understand their own language, and practise immersion, therefore immersion is the only allowable mode of baptism. But this argument is more specious than sound. Although there were several causes of disturbance between the eastern and western portions of the church, yet a total and final separation did not take place until the eleventh century. Then, for one thousand years, the whole church had all the benefit of the wisdom and teachings of the Greek fathers; and the doctrines and customs of the two portions of the church were nearly the same, and in respect to baptism entirely the same, and the ordinary mode was immersion. Our baptist brethren will reply: This is what

we contend for; and the Greek church, being more pure than the Latin church, retains immersion. Any argument founded on the purity of the Greek church is utterly fallacious; for the Greek church is now, and ever has been, about as corrupt as the Latin church, as the following tenets, to which she holds, will show. She holds that the sacrament ought to be given to children immediately after baptism. She prays for the dead. She practises the invocation of saints. She holds that auricular confession is a positive church injunction. She maintains that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and not from the Son. She believes in predestination. She admits of painted images and sculptures in copper and silver. She observes a number of holy days, and keeps four fasts in the year more solemn than the rest. She holds the doctrine of consubstantiation. She holds tradition as a source of doctrine. Her services consist almost entirely of outward forms.

"Since the Greeks became subject to the Turkish yoke, they have sunk into the most deplorable ignorance; and their religion is now greatly corrupted. It is, indeed, little better than a heap of ridiculous ceremonies and absurdities." Buck's Theol. Dic. p. 204.

I repeat, then, that any argument founded on the purity or intelligence of the Greek church is utterly fallacious. But Mr. F. speaks of the Greek church as though it was entirely or mostly made up of Greeks; when the fact is, that, probably not more than one for every hundred of her communicants, is a native Greek. This church embraces, besides part of Greece and the Grecian isles, Wallachia, Moldavia, Egypt, Abyssinia, Nubia, Lybia, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia, Palestine, the Russian empire in Europe, a part of Siberia, Astracan, Casan, and Georgia. Many of the above are very ignorant and superstitious people; and the Greek church, taken as a whole, has about as little to recommend it as a great exemplar of christian doctrine and orthodoxy, as any other leading church in the world. But our baptist brethern will say, that it is only so far as baptism is concerned, that they hold up this church as a great exemplar. Very well, let us examine into her faith and practice in this respect. It is true she ordinarily practises immersion—some accounts say she uses affusion too—but she immerses the subject three times; not because she has any superior illumination on the Greek verb, but because she believes that water baptism will cleanse from sin, and that three immersions are necessary to a full purification from original sin. In this way, and for this cause, she baptizes both *infants* and adults. Amer. Ency. vol. vi. p. 46.

Will our baptist brethren follow their illustrious exemplar in all these respects? Will she immerse her subjects three times? Will she immerse infants too? And for the cause mentioned above—thus following up the good old notion, that as water cleanses from sin, a great deal of it is better than a little? No shuffling, brethren; stick to your pattern. The Greek church understands Greek, and with many of you, that seems to be the test of orthodoxy, then go the whole figure, and be consistent one time.

Our Baptist brethren are so at war with every thing that does not favour their system, that, as already said, they have fallen out with our good old English version of the Scriptures, which has been used by all protestants for two hundred years; and they profess to be divinely called to the guardianship of the Holy Oracles. Hence they charge and publish to the world, that King James and the forty-seven translators, through collusion, obscured a part of God's holy word, and published an unfaithful translation to the world. Now, can any one believe that those forty-seven translators were such a set of hypocrites, as to cover up any part of God's holy word, or add anything thereto, while the dreadful penalty of such conduct was before their eyes? The testimony concerning those men is, that they were the most learned and pious of the kingdom, and that their translation is faithful—giving "*a true, clear and full account of the divine dispensations, and of the gospel of our salvation: insomuch that whoever studies the Bible, the English Bible, is sure of gaining that knowledge and faith, which, if duly applied to the heart and conversation, will infallibly guide him to eternal rest.*" This is the testimony of such men as Horne, Clarke, Selden, Bishop Watson, B. Lowth, B. Horsley, B. Middleton, Dr. Geddes, Rev. J. W. Whitaker, Dr. Doddridge, Dr. John Taylor, Dr. James Beattie, &c. And yet our Baptist friends charge, that those men, great and good as they were, being influenced by the king, corruptly published to the world a translation of the Bible which they knew to be wrong. Surely they have never learned the character of those men, nor seen the directions which king James gave them, or they never could make statements so at variance with the truth. There is no evidence to sustain them in these allegations, save their own suspicions, and unsupported declarations. Our version has stood thus long, and by its own inherent merit and faithfulness it will still withstand all the wild dashings of sectarian zeal, and when these feverish agitations of experiment and alteration are over, it will still be the Bible as it is, shedding forth its heavenly light to guide the humble

enquirer in the pathway of duty, that leads to God and heaven.

Our Baptist friends tell us that baptize, and baptism, are but Greek transferred. These words they would strike from the sacred canon, and supply their place by, immerse and immersion; for they are greatly alarmed, at what they call "the popish artifice of transfer." Well, if baptize and baptism are Greek transferred; immerse and immersion are Latin transfered; and it is well known that the Latin has always been the favourite language of the Romish church. Most of her church services and theology are written in Latin. Then, with their new Bible, our baptist friends will be nearer to this "mother of harlots," than their Pædo-baptist brethren, whom they charge with upholding the "main pillar of popery." Then, why alter the Bible? Has it not, as it is, guided its millions to everlasting rest? Has one soul ever been lost for want of the proposed alteration? Then, why alter it? There is no shadow of necessity for it, and prudence admonishes us to let that, which has always done well, alone.

By such alteration of the word of God, our Baptist friends have altered the name of one of the christian sacraments from baptism to immersion—an alteration which is unfortunate and unjustifiable, view it as you will. With the term *baptism*, the mind readily and easily associates every spiritual blessing, which it represents. Not because the mind has been accustomed so to do; but more especially because, there is a fitness—a happy congruity, between the outward washing, or purification of baptism, and that inward cleansing or purification of the Holy Ghost, which is represented by baptism. But there is no such happy association of ideas with the term—immersion. There is no natural and easy fitness, between that act, and the spiritual cleansing of the Holy Ghost; for we are not *dipped* or *plunged* into the Holy Ghost, but he is represented as being shed forth, or "poured out" upon us. Then if any mode is suggested by the thing signified in baptism, it is the mode of affusion. But, as we have already said, there is no moral worth in mode, and whoever makes mode the principal thing—the prime consideration, has laid aside the true meaning and intent of baptism, and taken the mere shadow for the substance. And yet Mr. F. says, that "mode is every thing"—and that immersion is the "essence of baptism." What, then, is immersion? It is a specific act, embracing the naked and barren idea of a mere plunging into the water. It does not necessarily embrace the idea of cleansing; and especially as a mode of baptism it does not,

Mr. F. himself being judge. He says, as already quoted, that "baptizo does not refer to the cleansing or purifying process, but it refers entirely to mode." That is, to baptize, does not mean to cleanse or purify, it only means to immerse or plunge into water. We say that, to baptize, means to cleanse or purify, without any reference whatever to the mode; and that this sense of baptism fitly corresponds to the thing represented—viz. the internal cleansing, purification, or baptism of the Holy Ghost. This is the difference between us. Let an intelligent public judge. Our Baptist brethren have altered the Bible, so as to change baptize and baptism, to immerse and immersion. Thus materially altering the sense and name of one of the sacraments of the church.

We object to the alteration; because "*baptism*" is a name venerable and sanctified, both by age and long-established usage—a name derived from that language in which the New Testament was first written, and a name which, in itself, has a fitness for the thing represented by it. We object farther, because, "*immersion*" is a new name, not found in any Bible in the world, except the late Baptist Bible,—a name introduced by sectarian zeal—a name, which, in itself, has no fitness for the thing represented in Christian baptism—a name which is derived from a language in which the original Scriptures were never written, but a language always in favour with the Romish Church, and therefore a name, which savours more or less of popery. For the above reasons, we say, that the change in question is unfit, unscriptural, and unjustifiable; and we are willing again for the public to judge between us.

As said before, our Baptist friends have abused king James and the translators. In this we say they are unjustifiable, because, apart from their vague conjectures, there is not a particle of evidence, so far as I have been able to learn, to sustain their allegations. Again, let the public judge.

Though our Baptist brethren seem determined, by altering the Bible—by close communion—by bold prerogatives —high assumptions, &c. &c., to force public sentiment, yet, by the use of such means, they will never be able to effect their purpose, as time will abundantly determine.

Again; we can but think that our Baptist friends are unfortunate in their choice of immersion, as a substitute for baptism, for another reason, immersion, as we have said, only means a plunging or thrusting down into the water, and here its meaning stops. Then, its meaning does not extend to the act of lifting up, or taking out again.

But our Baptist friends will say, it necessarily implies this. Not at all. If I throw a rock into the water, it is immersed, and though it lie at the bottom forever, all the meaning of immersion is answered. The lifting of it up again, would be a very different act. All the finally impenitent will be *plunged* or *immersed* into hell. Does this imply that they will be lifted up, or taken out again? No such meaning belongs to immersion, either literally or impliedly. Now our Baptist brethren are great sticklers for the proper meaning of words, and for a "thus saith the Lord," for every thing they do. Then why do they not confine themselves, as they profess to do, to the true meaning of their dear immersion? When they immerse a person, why do they lift him up again? All the meaning of immersion is complied with in the former act. This lifting up is a different matter, not embraced in the meaning of immersion. But I do not blame them for thus lifting up their subjects out of the water; but I do blame them for attaching so much importance to a word, as to make it a test of Christian communion and church membership, when, at the same time, they do not confine *themselves* to its meaning. I do blame them for foisting this word into the Bible, and striking baptism therefrom in order to make room for it, when the word itself does not mean quite enough for them. I make these remarks because, on last summer, when in controversy on the subject of baptism, I asked the man who was contending with me, of what he predicated the immersion of Philip. He replied, that he predicated his immersion of the act expressed by baptizo, which is used in the verse. Upon the meaning of this word he took his stand and bid defiance to all assault. By the meaning of this verb, he might, possibly, get Philip under the water, but according to the Baptist interpretation of its meaning, he could never get him out again; and if the eunuch had stuck as closely to its meaning, according to such interpretation, as my friend professed to do, Philip might have been under the water to this day. No, my brethren, it will not do. It strikes me, after all your ado, that you have got the wrong word; and I will suggest, that as you have commenced the experiment of altering the Bible, you should follow up that experiment until you get in a word, that will express the whole action—both the sinking down and the raising up. And if you cannot find any one word that will answer the purpose, join two or more words together, so as to have the idea fully expressed.

As already intimated, we take the ground that baptism implies a cleansing or purification, without any reference

to one particular mode exclusive of all others, and that whenever baptizo is used to express the action of Christian baptism, it is equivalent in meaning to καθαριζω (katharizo) *to purify*. As early as the days of John the Baptist, purification and baptism were considered as synonymous terms, as is evident from John iii. 25, 26. "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about καθαρισμου (katharismou) *purifying*. And they came to John and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, the same βαπτιζει (*baptizeth*,) and all men come to him."

Here was a dispute between John's disciples and the Jews about "*purifying*." The best commentators say that the Jews, (or Jew, as some of the best manuscripts read,) were such as had been baptized by some of Christ's disciples, and they and John's disciples were disputing, as to which was the more efficacious baptism—John's or Christ's. And they go to John to decide the question: saying "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, &c.—baptizeth, and all men come to him." Why is this: is his baptism superior to yours? John goes on to tell them that he is not the Christ, but that he must decrease, and Christ must increase; that is, that his baptism and dispensation must come to an end, while Christ's baptism and dispensation must increase and be perpetuated. Here then is a dispute about "*purifying*," and they appeal to John on the subject of *baptism* to settle it, and John proceeds to settle it, by giving the preference to Christ's baptism. Now if the decision of John, concerning baptism, could settle the dispute about "*purifying*," then it is as clear as a sun-beam, that baptism and purification, in the New Testament, are synonymous, and that to baptize properly means to purify.

In proof of the above position, there is an abundance more of evidence in the New Testament, and in the writings of the early fathers; but the limits of this work forbid me now to go fully into the argument. If it be required hereafter, I have the proof at hand. It is enough for the present, that I have fully met, and shown the fallacy of Mr. Furman's main position—that *baptizo means to immerse and nothing else*. Whoever, in the mean time, wishes to see the above position fully argued, and ably sustained, will do well to consult the treatise of Dr. Beecher, found in the Bib. Repos. for 1842–43, and Hibbard on Baptism.

Mr. F. makes a short quotation from the German translation of the Bible, in which, as usual, he is utterly incorrect. On page 16, he says; "*der Tauffer*" means "*the Dipper*," i. e. John the Dipper.

Here his zeal for dipping has destroyed his knowledge of the German language, if he ever had any. The expression in the German Bible, "*Johan der Täufer*," literally and properly means *John the Baptist*. This every German scholar knows; for "*Täufer*" comes from *taufen*, which means "to baptize, to christen a child." *Taufen* is derived from the Latin verb *tingo*, to die, colour, sprinkle, &c. In proof of the above, the Germans, as a nation, in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, have ever used sprinkling, and never immersion. When a German wishes to convey the idea of immersion, dipping, diving, or plunging, he uses the verb, *Tauchen*, which means "to duck, dive, dip," &c., and *Taucher*, derived from the above, means, "diver, plunger, *dipper*." Tunken, also means to "dip, immerse, steep," &c. Hence the denomination called Dunkers, which arose in a German settlement in Pennsylvania a little more than a hundred years ago. They practised immersion, hence they were called Dunkers, or Tunkers, by their German neighbours.

Then it is evident that, "Johan der Täufer," does not mean John the Dipper, as Mr. F. says, but John the Baptist. The proper expression for John the Dipper, would be *Johan der Taucher* or *Johan der Tunker*.

I have more evidence on the same point, from the best German scholars in our country, but the above is sufficient to set Mr. F. right with his German Bible.

III. Mr. Furman relies with much confidence upon what he has given us as the testimony of Paedo-baptist writers, in favour of his view of baptism. And really he exhibits much skill in the art of culling. Whatever suits his purpose is taken, and no more; so that he often very unfairly presses these authors into his service, by taking detached portions of their writings from their proper connection, and thus giving a partial and incorrect statement of their sentiments, Shakspeare says: "Look on this picture, and on *this*." Now, gentle reader, let us bring some of the most distinguished of these—Mr. Furman's Paedo-baptist witnesses—upon the stage, and let them speak for themselves, and when we hear their full sentiments, we shall be better able to judge how far they favour his high and exclusive notion of immersion.

Mr. Furman first quotes from John Calvin as follows: "The word baptize signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church." Page 10 of his sermons.

Now let Calvin speak for himself. He says: "But whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed,

and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance; churches ought to be left at liberty in this respect to act according to the difference of countries." Then follows the quotation of Mr. F.—Calvin's Institutes, London edition, vol. 2, p. 434.

Now, why did not Mr. F. give Calvin's views of baptism in full? Was he afraid to let his readers know that Calvin believed just what Pædo-baptists of the present day believe on that subject? Is it fair and right in Mr. F. thus to trifle with the sentiments of an author, and keep his readers in the dark, by suppressing a part of the truth? The correct rule of making quotations, is, to give all that an author says on any particular subject, or enough thereof to convey his meaning in full. Whoever departs from this rule, acts dishonestly with the author from whom he quotes, and dishonestly with the people for whom he writes.

Again: Mr. Furman makes the following quotation from Dr. Wall. "It is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that immersion was the original mode of administering the ordinance, that one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of Pædo-baptists who deny it." Not so Mr. F. You have, not only, again. withheld a very material part of what Dr. Wall says upon the mode of baptism, but you have mis-quoted what you have pretended to give. At the place from which you have taken your *mis*-quotation, Wall is speaking of the mode of baptism in the second century, and says:—"This"(the mode of dipping as the general and ordinary way,) "is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that, as one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such pædo-baptists as would maintain the negative of it; so also we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English antipædo-baptists merely for their use of dipping." Now, your *mis*-quotation represents Dr. Wall as saying that immersion was the *original* mode of baptism; but the *true* quotation represents him as saying that immersion was the mode *generally and ordinarily practised one hundred years after the time of the apostles.* Then your quotation is wrong in a very material point, for the *ordinary* mode of baptism in the second century, may not have been the *original* mode, and it cannot be proved that it was. But let us hear Dr. Wall farther. Immediately following the above quotation, he says: "It is one thing to maintain that, that circumstance (viz immersion) is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another, to go about to represent it as ridiculous and fool-

ish, or as shameful and indecent, &c." Then, while Wall regards immersion as an ancient and valid mode of baptism, and that therefore it should not be scoffed at, yet he says, *it "is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism."* Thus Mr. Furman's very distinguished witness, which he has brought forward to prove that his view of baptism is right, very positively condemns him. For Mr. F. says, "that the essence of baptism consists in a burial beneath the water and a resurrection therefrom." Dr. Wall says that *this* "is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism." So that, instead of its being—Dr. Wall *for* "Mr. Furman of Cheraw"—it is Dr. Wall *against* him.

But let us hear Dr. Wall still farther. In the same connection he says:—"On the other side, the antipædo-baptists will be as unfair in their turn, if they do not grant that in cases of sickness, weakliness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasions, baptism by affusion of water on the face was by the ancients counted sufficient baptism." Thus Dr. Wall speaks of pouring as a mode of baptism existing in the second century, as well as immersion. And this mode must have been common, if used under all the above circumstances. The above quotations may all be found in Wall's His. Inf. Baptism. II Vol. pp. 384–5. Cotton's Edition.

Here, again, I am compelled to charge Mr. Furman with injustice to his author, and injustice to his readers; for in the first place he misquotes Dr. Wall; in the second place he suppresses a very material part of his testimony. Surely the cause of Mr. F. cannot be quite so full of the elements of "eternal truth," as he would have us believe, when it requires such miserable shifts to sustain it.

Again, Mr. Furman brings in Mr. Wesley as one of his witnesses. He quotes from his works, vol. iii. p. 20. "Mary Welsh, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church, and the rule of the church of England, by immersion." And from his notes on the New-Testament, Rom. vi. 4, "Buried with him, alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

As to the first quotation, it is admitted that Mr. Wesley did, when a young man, and a missionary in Georgia, baptize infants by immersion. But he did it in obediencce to a law of the church of England, of which he was then a minister. The Rev. Rowland Hill, after this, charged him with inconsistency in holding the validity of baptism by affusion, when he had practised the other mode. Mr. Wesley defends himself by telling Mr. Hill, that he did not immerse because he had any scruple as to the validity of

pouring and sprinkling, but in obedience to the rubric of his church. Wesley's works, vol. vi. p. 157.

As to the second quotation; we learn this from it, and only this: That Mr. Wesley, with other eminent men, believed that immersion was in use very early in the christian church, but he by no means considered it the only allowable mode, or the only mode then in use. This we prove from his note on Matt. iii. 6, found in the same book from which Mr. F. takes his quotation. Here it is. "Such prodigious numbers could hardly be baptized by immerging their whole bodies under water: nor can we think they were provided with change of raiment for it, which was scarcely practicable for such vast multitudes. And yet they could not be immerged naked with modesty, nor in their wearing apparel with safety. It seems, therefore, that they stood in ranks on the edge of the river, and that John, passing along before them, cast water on their heads and faces, by which means he might baptize many thousands in a day. And this way most naturally signified Christ's baptizing them *with the Holy Ghost and with fire, &c.*

But let us examine Mr. Wesley's views more at large upon this subject. They are found in his works, vol. vi. pp. 12, 13, 14.

"The matter of this sacrament is water; which, as it has the natural power of cleansing, is the more fit for this symbolical use. Baptism is performed by *washing*, dipping or sprinkling the person, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, who is hereby devoted to the ever blessed Trinity. I say by *washing*, *dipping*, *or sprinkling*, because it is not determined in Scripture in which of these ways it shall be done, neither by any express precept, nor by any such example as clearly proves it; nor by the force and meaning of the word *baptize*."

"That there is no express precept, all calm men allow. Neither is there any conclusive example. John's baptism, in some things, agreed with Christ's; in others, differed from it. But it cannot certainly be proved from Scripture, that even John's was performed by dipping. It is true he baptised in Enon, near Salim, where there was much water. But this might refer to breadth, rather than depth; since a narrow place would not have been sufficient for so great a multitude. Nor can it be proved, that the baptism of our Saviour, or that administered by his disciples, was by immersion. No, nor that of the eunuch baptized by Philip, though they both went down to the water: for that going down may relate to the chariot, and implies no determinate depth of water. It might be up to their knees; it might not be above their ankles.

"And, as nothing can be determined from Scripture, precept or example, so, neither from the force or meaning of the word; for the words *baptize* and *baptism* do not necessarily imply *dipping*, but are used in other senses in several places. Thus we read that the Jews were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea—1. Cor. x. 2., but they were not plunged in either. They could, therefore, be only sprinkled by drops of the sea-water, and refreshing dews from the cloud; probably intimated in that 'Thou sentest a gracious rain upon thine inheritance, and refreshedst it when it was weary.' Psalm lxviii. 9. Again: Christ said to his two disciples, 'Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with,' Mark x. 38., but neither he nor they were dipped, but only sprinkled or washed with their own blood. Again, we read, Mark vii. 4. of the baptisms (so it is in the original) of pots and cups, and tables or beds. Now, pots and cups are not necessarily dipped when they are washed. Nay, the Pharisees washed the outsides of them only. And as for tables or beds, none will suppose they could be dipped. Here, then, the word baptism, in its natural sense, is not taken for dipping, but for washing or cleansing. And that this is the true meaning of the word *baptize*, is testified by the greatest scholars and most proper judges in this matter. It is true we read of being 'buried with Christ in baptism,' but nothing can be inferred from such a figurative expression. Nay, if it held exactly, it would make as much for sprinkling as for plunging; since, in burying, the body is not plunged through the substance of the earth, but rather earth is poured or sprinkled upon it.

"And as there is no clear proof of dipping in scripture, so there is very probable proof of the contrary. It is highly probable, the apostles themselves baptized great numbers, not by dipping, but by washing, sprinkling, or pouring water. This clearly represented the cleansing from sin, which is figured by baptism. And the quantity of water used was not material; no more than the quantity of bread and wine in the Lord's supper. The jailor 'and all his house, were baptized in the prison; Cornelius with his friends, (and so several households), at home. Now, is it likely that all these had ponds or rivers, in or near their houses, sufficient to plunge them? every unprejudiced person must allow the contrary is far more probable. Again: three thousand at one time, and five thousand at another, were converted and baptized by St. Peter at Jerusalem, where they had none but the gentle waters of Siloam; according to the observation of Mr. Fuller: 'there were no water-mills in Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive them.' The place, therefore, as well

as the number, makes it highly probable that all these were baptized by sprinkling or pouring, and not by immersion. To sum up all, the manner of baptizing (whether by dipping or sprinkling) is not determined in scripture. There is no command for one rather than the other. There is no example from which we can conclude for dipping rather than sprinkling. There are probable examples of both; and both are equally contained in the natural meaning of the word."

The above quotations set forth, in full, Mr. Wesley's views on the mode of baptism. They show that he believed, that the mode of sprinkling or pouring is equally as ancient and valid as immersion, and that in scripture, there are probable examples of both. How very different is this from what Mr. F. would have the public to believe, from his very partial and unfair quotations? No, gentle reader, Mr. Wesley's mind was never quite so *watery* as to be carried away by the charm of the mere mode or circumstance of a sacrament. His views were more liberal, enlightened and charitable, than to permit him ever to take the shadow for the substance, or give in to the high-toned views of any sect which regarded themselves superior to all others. Then, it turns out in this, as in the other case; Mr. Furman's very important witness, when allowed to speak for himself, is most positively and unequivocally against him. And now I ask again: why did not Mr. Furman give his readers the whole truth? Where was candour? Where was fairness? *Where was conscience?* when he thus violently pressed Mr. Wesley into the service of a cause, whose sectarian exclusiveness is contrary to every principle of the nature of that great and good man, and to every doctrine which he ever inculcated.

But Mr. Furman, supposing it probable that some might be disposed to examine for themselves, has added a note of comment to his quotations, equally as objectionable as the quotations themselves. In that note there are five sentences, and every one, is incorrect but one, as I will show. The first sentence is as follows:

"The author is aware that attempts have been made by some to deny, and by others to explain away these admissions of Wesley."

Not correct. We neither deny, nor attempt to explain them away. But we explain Mr. Wesley's meaning by giving *all* that he says upon the subject. This is the only correct rule of interpretation. This rule we have followed. This rule Mr. F. has violated.

The second sentence in the note is as follows: "But all such attempts are of no avail."

Not correct. For these our "*attempts*," as Mr. F. calls them, to explain Mr. Wesley's meaning, and to give correctly his views on the mode of baptism, *will avail*; and Mr. F. shall see it, if he live, and feel it too.

The third sentence. "It matters not what Mr. Wesley says in other parts of his writings."

Not correct. For it does materially matter what an author says, in different parts of his writings, upon the same subject; for it is upon *all* that an author says upon any given point, and not upon isolated parts, that the true interpretation of his meaning is founded. This is the correct rule, as all the world allows, "*no matter what*" Mr. F. says to the contrary.

Fourth sentence. "In the passages referred to, he declares *positively*, and *unequivocally*, that *immersion was the custom of the first church,—and that, buried with him, alludes to the ancient manner of immersion.*"

Although the language of the above quotations is correct, yet the impression which Mr. F. intended to make by them on the public mind, is, doubtless, incorrect. For he, no doubt, intended to make the impression upon the minds of his readers that Mr. Wesley regarded immersion as the only ancient mode, or the only allowable mode. He could have had no other use for Mr. Wesley's testimony. His very partial and unfair quotations show that this was his intention. But I have abundantly shown that Mr. Wesley regarded sprinkling and pouring as equally ancient and valid with immersion.

Fifth sentence. "Wesley has long been in his grave, and it is now too late to deny, or explain away, or alter what he has himself asserted, without adding the slightest qualification in connection with these declarations."

Not correct. For Mr. Wesley has fully qualified "these declarations," viz. your isolated quotations above. In his works, from which you first quote, he qualifies the meaning of your quotation, and fully gives you his mind upon the subject. In his notes, from which you secondly quote, he fully explains, and qualifies his meaning, as I have already abundantly shown. How can you say, then, that he has not added the "slightest qualification in connection with these declarations?" But, perhaps, Mr. F. means by "connection," that Mr. Wesley has given no qualification of his meaning on the very page, and in the very paragraph, from which he quotes. If so, he is as exclusive and incorrect in his notion of "*connection*," as he is in his views of baptism. Surely any man that looks through the clear atmosphere of truth, and not through the watery mists of the exclusive dipping dogma, can see far enough

to know, that all that an author says on any particular subject, though in different parts of his work, is to be taken in connection with that subject, and the different parts in connection with themselves. So much for the note.

By the the method which Mr. Furman has adopted in his quotations, any thing may be proved from an author who writes much. By his method the most shocking blasphemy,—even atheism itself,—may be proved from the Bible. No author is safe in the hands of such a writer; for he sets up his standard with the seeming intention of bending, or, if need be, of breaking down, every thing thereto, with the iron arm of arbitrary power. If he finds in the writings of an author, an isolated sentence which seems to suit his purpose, he takes it out of its connection, and sets it down as the true exponent of the author's views, and suppresses or condemns every thing else, which justice and truth require him to set forth. Can Mr. F. expect to benefit his cause by such a course? Upon his quotations from Calvin and Wall, I was disposed to look with some degree of allowance, inasmuch as I supposed that he took them upon the faith of another, not having carefully examined those authors for himself; but in the present instance I can allow him no apology; for on an occasion which I know he very well remembers, Wesley's views in full upon the mode of baptism, were faithfully read to him. So that he cannot be ignorant of what those views are. I am, therefore compelled to charge him with publishing to the world, a *wilful* perversion of Mr. Wesley's views on this subject. This is a serious charge, and I have not made it without reluctance and hesitation. But what less can I say under the circumstances? Mr. Furman may attempt to relieve himself by saying, that he only intended to give Mr. Wesley's view of baptism so far as immersion is concerned. Aye; this is quite manifest, but it is nothing to the purpose; for to suppress a material part of the truth, is as manifest a perversion of the truth, as to publish something else in its stead.

Again; In his sermon of 1840, already alluded to, Mr. Furman thus introduces Dr. Clarke as one of his learned witnesses in favor of immersion.

"Dr. Adam Clarke, the very learned and distinguished Methodist Commentator, says that the baptism of John was by plunging the whole body, as appears from those things related of him. The same author says, in his note on Romans vi. 4. When the baptized person came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life." Sermon, page 15.

As to the first part of the quotation, professedly taken

from Clarke's commentary at the end of Mark; I pronounce it utterly incorrect. Dr. Clarke never used such language, nor any like it. So far from it, that the language which he does use relative to John's baptism, is directly opposed to the quotation, as I shall show presently. The language which Mr. Furman here attributes to Dr. Clarke, is the language of Dr. Lightfoot, found in a quotation which Dr. Clarke takes from that author, as any one may see by examining his commentary at the end of Mark.

As to the second part of the quotation, taken from Clarke's commentary on Romans, vi. 4, I pronounce that incorrect also, because it is partial, unfair, and unjust. Mr. F. here again follows that favourite rule of his, which presses every thing into his service, in spite of truth and candour. He takes an isolated passage out of its proper connection, and sets it down as the true exponent of the author's views. Whoever will examine Clarke's Commentary on the above passage, will find that he says it is only "*probable*" that immersion is here alluded to, and that it is not absolutely certain, as some imagine; "for, (says Clarke, in the next verse), our being incorporated into Christ by *baptism*, is also denoted by our being *planted*, or rather, *grafted together in the likeness of his death;* and Noah's ark *floating* upon the water, and *sprinkled by the rain from Heaven*, is a figure corresponding to *baptism*, 1 Peter, iii. 20, 21, but neither gives us the same idea of the outward form of *burying*. We must be careful, therefore, not to lay too much stress upon such circumstances. Drowning, among the ancients, was considered the most noble kind of death; some think that the Apostle may allude to this, &c." But that the reader may see yet more clearly, if possible, the great injustice of Mr. F. in thus attempting to press the weight of Dr. Clarke's character, into the service of his exclusive dipping dogma, let us notice the Doctor's views more at large upon the subject. He says:

"In what form baptism was originally administered, has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute. Were the people dipped or sprinkled? for it is certain that *bapto* and *baptizo* mean both. They were all dipped, say some. Can any man suppose that it was possible for John to dip all the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea, and all the country round about Jordan? Were both men and women dipped? for certainly both came to his baptism. This could never have comported either with safety or decency. Were they dipped in their clothes? This would have endangered their lives, if they had not with them a change

of raiment: And as such a baptism as John's, (however administered) was, in several respects a new thing in Judea, it is not at all likely that the people would come thus provided. But suppose they were dipped, which I think it would be impossible to prove, does it follow that in all regions of the world men and women must be dipped, in order to be evangelically baptized? In the eastern countries, bathings were frequent, because of the heat of the climate, it being there so necessary to cleanliness and health: but could our climate, or a more northerly one, admit of this with safety, for at least three-fourths of the year? We may rest assured that it could not. Those who are dipped or immersed in water, in the name of the holy Trinity, I believe to be evangelically baptized: those who are washed or sprinkled with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, I believe to be equally so; and the repetition of such a baptism, I believe to be profane. Others have a right to believe the contrary, if they see good. After all it is the thing signified, and not the mode, which is the essential part of the sacrament." Clarke's Theology, pp. 153–4. Commentary on Matthew iii. and at the end of Mark.

Thus Dr. Clarke plainly and unequivocally sets forth his views on the mode of baptism; and those views are precisely such as Pædo-baptists have ever held. Who, then, would have supposed, that a writer of Mr. Furman's pretensions, would ever have attempted to press the Doctor into the service of his "*sinking cause?*" He must have been culpably ignorant of Clarke's views on this subject, or utterly reckless of them, and only careful to find a sentence, which, taken out of its proper connection, would seem to favour his cause. Charity would suggest to us the former supposition, but facts seem to urge us to the latter; for, in the first place, he makes a false quotation from Dr. Clarke, and, in the second place, he follows his favourite rule, and takes out of its proper connection a few lines, and keeps back all the balance, as shown above; and in both instances cites the place from which he quotes. Now, if he did truly examine Dr. Clarke's views on the mode of baptism, as he would have us believe, from the manner in which he writes, then I charge him with wilful misrepresentation, or a degree of stolidity which I cannot think belongs to him. But the presumption is, that he had never examined Dr. Clarke for himself, when he made the above quotations, but that he took them from the Comprehensive Commentary—a book in great favour with the Baptist Church, it being made up, in good part, of *suitable* and *con-*

venient scraps, taken from different commentators; aye, and, in some instances, at least, by that very rule, which, like a magic wand, in the hands of Mr. Furman, works out such wonders for his cause. By a touch of this rule, an author is, in a moment, converted into a swift witness, in favour of the Baptist dogma, no matter what he says to the contrary. Mr. F. may complain of this, in as much as he had stricken Dr. Clarke from his list of witnesses before he wrote in 1843. I am aware that the Doctor is not permitted to figure as a witness in his late publication. But wherefore? Of course he has found out, that his Comprehensive commentary is a little too *comprehensive*; hence, "the very *learned and distinguished Methodist commentator*" is laid on the shelf. Then why did he not do justice to his readers in 1843, by telling them, that he had done injustice to Dr. Clarke and them in 1840? This candor required. But the demand was not paid; hence these strictures.

Mr. Furman and others who have written and preached on the subject of baptism, have thus, very unfairly attempted to press Wesley and Clarke into their service. Such attempts are as ill-advised and unwise as they are astonishing. Do they think that those who have the writings of those great and good men are ignorant of what they teach? If so, they presume much upon our ignorance. But their object in all this, I think, is obvious. There are many Methodists in the country almost every where, and if they could be brought to believe that these great lights in their church,—Wesley and Clarke,—were immersionists, then the work of proselyting would be easier. But such attempts are too disingenuous to be successful. Methodists are not yet quite so stupid as to need this most gracious intervention of Mr. F. and others, to explain to them the meaning of their standard writers; nor quite so gullible as to be humbugged in this way. When we need the learned effusions of Baptist preachers in this matter, we will so advise them; but, in the mean time, we protest against all such interference, and especially against the miserable garbling of Mr. Furman. Then let these good brethren from henceforth know, that we understand the writings of our Wesleys and Clarkes too well to be misled by such imbecile attempts.

Again: Mr. Furman introduces Professor Stuart, of Andover, as one of his witnesses, with the following quotation. "It is a thing made out that immersion was the ancient mode of baptism." I am compelled again to pronounce the quotation incorrect. It is not the language of Professor Stuart. In his treatise on baptism, page 75, you will find the following:

"It is," says Augusti, (Denkw. vii. p. 216) "a thing made out," 'viz. the ancient practice of immersion.' It is true that Professor Stuart endorses this quotation from Augusti, &c. which only represents the practice of immersion as ancient,—a thing not denied by any Pædo-baptist; while Mr. Furman's pretended quotation represents him as saying, that immersion was *the* ancient mode. But I should not have noticed this seemingly small discrepancy, if Mr. F. had been candid enough to deal honestly with Professor Stuart and his readers. In the very work from which he quotes, the main object of the learned Professor is to show that the high claims of Baptists are untenable; and this point he argues most ably and unanswerably. Unfortunately for Mr. F. the professor has fully defined his position, as the reader will see, by the following quotations from his treatise on baptism found on pp. 53, 92, 93.

"I do consider it as quite plain, that none of the circumstantial evidence" (of Scripture) "thus far, proves immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism, or even that of John. Indeed, I consider this point so far made out, that I can hardly suppress the conviction, that if any one maintains the contrary, it must be either because he is unable rightly to estimate the nature and power of the Greek language; or because he is influenced by party feeling; or because he has looked at the subject only in a partial manner." Again;—

"From all that has been said above, it is manifest, that the great body of Christians have long come to the full conviction, that no one particular mode of baptism can be justly considered as essential to the rite itself." Again:—

"Have the sanctifying influences of the Spirit of God been limited to that part of the Christian Church exclusively, who practice immersion? So far from this, that the most vicious and ignorant of all who bear the name of Christians, are the most numerous and zealous of all the advocates of immersion."

Does this look like professor Stuart being a good witness for Mr. F? Whoever wishes to see the high popish claims of Baptists most ably, and yet calmly and classically rebuked, let him get and read the very writings of the learned professor, from which Mr. F. quotes. And yet he (Mr. F.) takes barely a line from those writings, and with that one single line, taken out of its proper connection, attempts to make his readers believe that the professor favours his cause, when the whole force of his giant mind and unanswerable pen is directly against him. Is not Mr. F. "ashamed" of such conduct? Where was his conscience, when he was thus

attempting to steal an able man from the ranks of Pædo-baptists, and set him up as one of his witnesses?

Mr. Furman makes many other quotations from different authors, but I have neither the time, space, nor patience, to follow him through them all. If necessity require it, it shall be done hereafter. So far as I have noticed his quotations, I find them to be very partial, uncandid, and unfair; and without consuming more time upon them, let those that I have proven to be so, serve as examples of the balance, and let me, for the present, be spared the disagreeable task of farther pointing out his errors on this part of the controversy. But I would here admonish Mr. F. that he was never more absurdly and unprofitably employed, than when attempting to press these learned Pædo-baptists into his service. Does he suppose that he can bring the public to believe, that they were all hypocrites—believing one thing and practising another—that is, that they believed the Baptist scheme to be right, while their practice was in direct opposition to it—thus counteracting their own principles? He may tell such things to those whose zeal for immersion has carried them beyond the regions of soberness and charity, and driven them into the most senseless extremes, and whose minds are so circumscribed by prejudice, as to be ready to receive any thing that looks *watery*,—(for when people get to think that they are right, and that every body else is wrong, they are then prepared to receive any thing that ministers to such arrogance and prejudice;) but if his zeal was according to that knowledge, which is ready to admit, that all wisdom is not concentrated in one man, or in one church, he would not make such weak attempts upon an intelligent public. But the notion of *great superiority*, is generally found coupled with the most arrogant presumption, hence Mr. F. very absurdly attempts to make people believe, that the great body of learned men among Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, &c., favour his notion of baptism, when their writings and practice directly contradict him. Such attempts are too feeble and sickly to merit a serious consideration.

It will be nothing to the purpose, for Mr. F. to say, that he only introduced these Pædo-baptist authors, to show that they believed the validity and antiquity of immersion; for all Pædo-baptists believe this; they have ever believed it. The question is: Why did not Mr. F. deal fairly with those authors by giving their testimony in full? Why did he attempt to keep his readers in the dark, by suppressing a very material part of the truth? Why did he

not tell them, that those very authors, whom he parades as his own witnesses, most positively condemn his high notions of immersion? Was it right, in making his quotations, to follow that partial, unfair, and one-sided rule, which candour, justice, and truth condemn? I ask: *Is such conduct right?* Does truth require such unfair dealing? Let conscience answer.

But farther:—On page 10 of his sermon, Mr. F. has the following language:

"Candid and learned men of all denominations, have always admitted that the Baptists are right in contending for immersion, as the original mode of administering christian baptism. Our opponents themselves are the judges, and they are *obliged* to admit that we are right."

Again: After having introduced his host of Pædo-Baptist witnesses, he very exultingly exclaims:

"What more could we ask for than this? It is an unanswerable vindication of the truth. Our cause is triumphant, my brethren. Our opponents themselves are the judges, and they admit all that we would ask, all that we could require. Here we have the united testimony of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, and Roman Catholics. They cannot deny the truth. They are obliged to admit it."

In the above quotations Mr. Furman declares, that the great body of "learned and candid men of all denominations"—"are *obliged* to admit that" Baptists "are right" in "*all*" that they "ask," and in "*all*" that they "require." Then, let us briefly inquire what it is that Baptists do "ask" and "require." 1. They "ask" and "require," that immersion is the only allowable mode of baptism. 2. They "ask" and "require" that none are fit to come to the Lord's table, but such as have been regularly and authentically immersed. 3. They "ask" and "require" that none are in the pale of Christ's visible Church except themselves, and those who practise immersion. Finally, they "ask," "require," and declare (especially Mr. F.) that all Pædobaptist churches stink of popery, and that *they* are right, while all who differ from them are wrong; and what is most ridiculous of all, they declare (in this part of the country) that Jesus Christ himself was a Baptist. In favour of all this, Mr. Furman declares that he has "the united testimony of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists and Roman Catholics." He thus represents the "learned and pious men" of all these denominations as giving evidence against themselves—as contradicting themselves in all their practice, and in all their teachings,

and as acknowledging themselves to be wrong; for if (as Mr. F. declares) they admit that Baptists are right in "*all*" that they "ask," and in "*all*" that they "require;" then surely this admission is but an acknowledgment, that they themselves are wrong in all that they do, and in all that they teach in this matter. Then, gentle reader, Mr. F. presents to your mind one of the following very ludicrous pictures. In the first place, he represents all these, his "candid and learned" Pædo-baptist witnesses, as coming up and saying: —Well, Mr. F., we "being the judges," you and the Baptists are right—right in "*all*" that you "ask," and in "*all*" that you claim; yet as we have abundantly shown in our writings, and taught by our practice, we know very well that you are wrong in your exclusive notions of baptism: or, if he is unwilling for his witnesses thus positively to contradict themselves, he next represents them as coming up and saying:—Well, Mr. F., we "admit" that you and the Baptist Church are right in "*all*" that you "ask," and in "*all*" that you "require," yet we are such a set of hypocrites, that we must contradict you by our writings and practice, and go on against what we are "*obliged to admit is right*," in baptizing adults and infants by pouring and sprinkling.

It is very unpleasant to be compelled to follow the assumptions of such a writer to their proper results. The truth is, there is not one of these Pædo-baptist authors, either among the living or the dead, that has ever admitted, that Baptists are right in "*all*" that they "ask," and in "*all*" that they "require." Then, we are at issue on this point, and I call upon Mr. F. to produce one single witness if he can, from all his host of "learned and pious" Pædo-baptists, who will admit "*all*" that Baptists "ask," and "require." He cannot do it; for no man can be such a witness, and at the same time a "candid Pædo-baptist." Hence he would be uncandid, and, therefore, unfit for a witness. I challenge him, then, to do it, but let him do it fairly; not by that false and very unfair rule which he adopted and followed through his whole list of quotations from Pædo-baptists, and by which he pressed those authors into the service of a cause which they never espoused. Let him adopt fair rules of interpretation. Let him come out like a man, and tell his readers the whole truth,—all that these authors say upon the subject. If he will, he will be compelled to recant what he has already said; for, I repeat, these, his Pædo-baptist witnesses, will not sustain him. They do not contradict themselves. They are not hypocrites. They do not blow hot and cold at the same

time. They are not for him and against him. Their testimony is uniform. Notwithstanding Mr. Furman's unworthy efforts to torture them into his service, I say, their testimony, when fully brought out, is uniformly against him. But Mr. F. is not alone in this matter. Most of the Baptist writers, of any note, that I have examined, fall into the same erroneous train of argument, and there is no doubt but Mr. F. has taken most of his quotations from them. When will they learn to argue in that open, manly and candid way which truth and religion require. Now if all their quotations were correct,—if all the great men whom they have brought forward, were good witnesses for them, this would be but a mere circumstance in their favor; for there is no conclusive argument in any array of great names. Indeed, if the controversy had to be settled by this, their favorite method of arguing, we could not fear a moment for the result. We could soon bring forward an array of great names in favor of Pædo-baptism, which would, forever, settle the controversy against them, and fill Mr. F. with shame and confusion for the presumptious and improper declaration, that "all true learning, and all true criticism, are in favor of immersion." But we choose to submit the questions in issue between us, to the test of real, manly argument and truth.

From the above, the reader will, at once, see how very weak and farcical are the attempts of Mr. Furman already alluded to; and, from hence, he may judge how very weak is the cause that requires such attempts to sustain it. And yet in these attempts there is something amusing. We see Mr. F. very adroitly stealing a brilliant category of names from Pædo-baptist ranks; setting them up as his own witnesses, and making them say just what suits his purpose, and no more. He then, as though he had found great spoil, commences in strains of the most triumphant exultation: *what more could we possibly ask for than this. It is an unanswerable vindication of the truth. Our cause is triumphant, my brethren.*

But how short-lived is the destiny of those false fires which he has kindled in his own bosom, and those spurious ecstacies into which he has worked himself; for, when the cross-examination comes, and these witnesses are permitted to speak out, all his premature joy is, in a moment, dashed to the ground; and, now, methinks I see him, filled with disappointment and chagrin, retiring from court, and muttering to himself,—I never expected them to tell the whole truth.

IV. Our Baptist brethren rely with much confidence on the examples of Christian baptism, given in the New-Testament, to prove that immersion is the only allowable mode. They begin with John the Baptist, and their argument runs thus: John was the first baptist. He immersed Christ. We, therefore, build upon John, and follow Christ, our great exemplar. But we take issue with them, and contend,

I. John was not a baptist, in the modern acceptation.

II. It is not positively certain that he did immerse Christ, and not at all probable that he generally immersed.

III. John's baptism was not the christian baptism.

IV. Though Christ was baptized by John, yet he did not receive John's baptism.

V. Christ did not intend his baptism as an example for Christians.

First. John was not a baptist in the modern acceptation. This is evident from the following considerations.

1. John was never immersed. In this position we are safe until the contrary is proved.

2. John preached and administered the baptism of repentance. Baptists of the present day preach and administer, what they call, believers' baptism.

3. John always preached the same kind of doctrine, viz., the doctrine of repentance, and faith in Him that was to come. Many of our Baptist brethren, and especially in this part of the country, sometimes preach particular election, or Calvinism; and, at other times, free grace, or that Christ died for all, and that all may be saved.

4. John was always consistent in his preaching; but many of our Baptist brethren are not. They sometimes exhort and persuade people to come to Christ, just as though they could come if they would. At other times they tell them, that none can come except those who are specially influenced, and that the elect only are favored with this special influence.

5. John never sat to hear experiences of grace, mixed up, as they frequently are, with dreams and mysterious visions; but modern baptists do. And although they do not profess *to know* for themselves, whether or not their own sins have been pardoned, they only have a hope; yet they set themselves up as judges of God's work, and gravely decide this question for others, and baptize them or not, according to their decision.

For the above reasons, and others that might be adduced we conclude, that John was not a baptist in the modern acceptation. But, says Mr. Furman, "he is not called John the *sprinkler*, nor John the *pourer*," (and in his ser-

mon, as he delivered it) "nor John the Methodist, but John the baptist." Aye, he is correctly called *John the Baptist.* Not because he was exclusively, like latter-day Baptists,— not because he *immersed*,— not because he *poured*,—not because he *sprinkled*,—but simply, because he *baptized.* Simply because the baptism of repentance which he preached and administered, was the distinguishing feature of his dispensation. So St. Paul is not called Paul the Baptist, nor Paul the Methodist, nor Paul the Presbyterian, but, *Paul the apostle*; because he was sent. Now, shall all who believe in the writings and doctrines of Paul take the name of Apostles? Truly, there would be as much reason for this, as for immersionists to take the name of Baptists, merely because John was called "the Baptist;" for John did not expect to be the founder of any sect, which was to continue, and through which the distinguishing name by which he was called, would be transmitted, in regular succession, down to the end of time. He expected his baptism and dispensation speedily to come to an end; for he expressly says "*I must decrease.*" If he expected any such thing as the perpetuity of his name, he was much deceived; for, from the days of John the Baptist, for fifteen hundred years, the name of Baptist, as the distinguishing appellation of any organized sect, was not known. Even those whom John baptized with his own hand were not called Baptists. They were called the disciples of John. As our Baptist brethren have such a perfect horror for "*Greek transferred*," it is somewhat surprising that they have not altered their denominational name; for "Baptist," is as manifestly a mere transfer of Greek, as "baptize" is. Wonder if there is any popish artifice in this? And how is it with their new Bible? Of course, if they are consistent, they do not permit it to be corrupted with the terms *baptist, baptism and baptize*, these hateful specimens of the "popish artifice of transfer." Then, alas! their own name is, by their own hand, excluded from their own bible. Truly, here is a seeming dilemma. But, as they have altered the Bible to suit their own views, they may not hesitate to alter their name to suit their Bible; and then what will become of Mr. Furman's splendid flourish about "*John the Baptist*?"

Secondly. It is not positively certain that John immersed Christ, and not probable that he generally immersed.

1. It is not positively certain that John immersed Christ. This proposition is considered by Mr. F. as almost, if not quite, blasphemous; for he professes to "tremble" for the man that would suggest such a thing; and flies to the ac-

count of Christ's baptism, as given in Matt, iii. 16, to prove that Christ was immersed. It is there said: "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up strightway, απο του ὑδατος, out of the water." Mr. F., and Baptists all, contend, that, as he went up out of the water, he must have been under it. Allow them all they claim, that is, that the translation "out of the water" is correct, and their conclusion by no means follows necessarily; for persons may go down into the water, and come up out of it hundreds of times, without going under it, as almost every man has done. But let me call spccial attention to the Greek expression, απο του ὑδατος (apo tou hudatos.) The Greek preposition *apo*, which is here translated out of, is usually translated, from, which is its primary meaning, according to Parkhurst, Donnegan, Groves, Schrevelius and others. In the same chapter, Mat. iii. 7, it is translated, *from*; as "who hath warned you to flee—apo—*from* the wrath to come." In Matt. i. 17, 24, it is translated *from* in both verses. In Matt. iii. 13, it is translated, *from*. In Matt. viii. 1, 11, it is translated, *from*. In Mark vii. 4, it is so translated, and in a number of other places too tedious to enumerate. Now if *from* is the primary meaning of *apo*, and if it is so frequently thus translated, why not so translate it in the account of Christ's baptism, and let it read "*from* the water," instead of "out of the water." To say the least of it, the former is as good a translation as the latter, and it is more in accordance with the primary meaning of *apo*. Then the expression he "went up out of the water" will not avail our Baptist friends. From it they never can make it out clearly, that Christ was immersed; and, as this is all the evidence they have, I still maintain the ground, that it is not positively certain that John did immerse Christ. And, yet, on page 19 of his sermon, Mr. F., in an ecstatic fancy-sketch, exclaims:

"See your meek and lowly Lord descending into the baptismal stream, and bowing beneath the wave, an emblem of his future grave."

Now, where is the positive evidence that he did bow beneath the wave? As I have shown, there is none. But suppose Christ did bow beneath the wave; was that an emblem of his future grave? Says Mr. F., it was. Then, when people follow him, as they say, down into the water, and bow beneath the wave; is that an emblem of *their* future grave? And is this the meaning and intent of Christian baptism? According to Mr. Furman it is; for, if we follow the example which, he says, Christ set us, our

baptism must be like his, both in mode and meaning. Otherwise he either set us no example, or, if he did, we do not follow it. Then, according to the teaching of Mr. F., it comes to this; that baptism by immersion only points to our future grave. Away with such crude, unscriptural doctrine! But Mr. F. will call all this "bare-faced and childlike quibbling," and will, probably, be thrown into aguish paroxysms; for he professes to "tremble" for the author of such sentiments. Let him reserve his trembling concern for other occasions; for if his arguments have failed to convince, his trembling can avail nothing. But Mr. F. may say, that he never intended to teach that immersion is an emblem of our future grave, but of Christ's future grave. This is equally objectionable; for we already have one appropriate sacrament to represent the suffering and death of Christ, instituted for that very purpose, and there is not a particle of evidence in the New Testament, that baptism was ever intended as an emblem of Christ's future grave. On the contrary, baptism is spoken of in connection with the internal cleansing, or baptism of the Holy Ghost, and as emblematical of it. To this it points. This is its true meaning and intent, according to Scripture; and whoever perverts its meaning, departs from Scripture to serve a favourite system. Moreover: admitting that Christ was immersed, this could not be an emblem of his future grave; for he was put into a sepulchre that was hewn out of the side of a rock. Now this, his burial, could never be fitly represented by a dipping, plunging, or thrusting down into the water.

11. It is not at all probable—indeed, it seems impossible, that John could have immersed all that came to his baptism.

1. On account of the multitudes that came. "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan." Mat. iii. 5. There were millions of people in the city and territory spoken of by Matthew, and he says they all flocked to John's baptism. It is not supposed that every one went, but the strong expression is to convince us that vast multitudes—*most* of the people went to his baptism. Some suppose that he baptized two millions. But we will suppose that he baptized only one tenth of that number—two hundred thousand. These must have been baptized in the space of about eighteen months, for John's ministry did not continue longer. Then he must have baptized some four hundred persons every day for more than five hundred days in succession; and allowing that he immersed one for every minute, this would

have kept him in the water, constantly, about seven hours each day. Now, standing in the water and immersing people is a laborious and exhausting exercise, and can any man be so infatuated as to believe, that John could have performed this mighty task, for more than five hundred days in succession? A man of herculean strength might possibly have performed it for a few days, but a giant's strength could not have sustained it long. Besides, a good portion of every day must have been consumed in preaching, and instructing the people; and if John was such a Baptist as those who profess to build upon him, he must have sat to hear experiences of grace; and four hundred such experiences, allowing five minutes to each, would consume more than two days, instead of one. But waiving this last consideration, we are safe in saying, that it is highly improbable,—aye impossible,—that John could have immersed the multitudes that flocked to his ministry. It may not be said in reply, that John was assisted by his disciples. This is mere conjecture,—vague speculation. There is not a particle of evidence, either positive or circumstantial, to support such a notion. Gentle reader, if you should ever hear one of the Johnites make this reply to the above argument, ask him for his evidence, *press* him for his evidence, keep him to the point, take no mere supposition. Do this, if you wish to see how a man is affected by the stress of difficulty.

2. That John baptized by immersion is utterly incredible on another account. It cannot be supposed that such vast multitudes could have been provided with changes of raiment on the spot, and it cannot be supposed that one in a thousand took the precaution to provide them on starting from home; for John's ministry and baptism was a thing entirely new. They had no experience in the matter, and probably not one in a thousand thought of being baptized when he left home. Again: So vast was the multitude that it must have been impracticable to find places of secresy for stripping and restripping, and the two sexes would not have done it in the presence of each other; and it cannot be supposed that they occupied different positions—the males to themselves, and the females to themselves; for in so vast a multitude, every man would wish to be with his own family to take care of them. And again: The sacred historian mentions none of these things, and it is not likely that they would all have been overlooked if they had taken place. Hence the idea of changes of raiment, and the changing of raiment is utterly precluded by the circumstances. But the multitudes could not have

been immersed naked. Decency forbade that. They could could not have been immersed without a change of raiment. Safety forbade that. Then the irresistible inference is; they were not immersed at all.

3. According to John's own account of his baptism, he did not practise immersion. He says: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentence" But, "He (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Mat. iii. 11. What does John mean when he says, I baptize *with* water? Surely he does not mean that he immerses in water. The simple meaning of the expression is, that he applies the water to the subject and not the subject to the water. It will bear no other meaning. Our Baptist brethren feel the force of this; hence they alter the translation of the verse by changing *baptize* to *immerse*, and by translating the Greek particle εν by *in*, instead of with, as it now stands. Thus making the former part of the verse read: "I indeed *immerse* you in water." With this alteration they are very much pleased. It suits their sectarian purpose very well. But alas! they find, to be consistent, they must carry their alteration through the verse. And for one time, they are consistent enough to let a rule work through a *whole verse* of Scripture. And although it makes nonsense; yet for the sake of getting the first clause in the verse fixed to their notion, they march boldly through, and make nonsense of the latter clause. The whole verse thus altered will read: "I indeed *immerse* you in water—but He shall *immerse* you *in* the Holy Ghost, and *in* fire." Now, who ever thought of being *immersed* into the Holy Ghost? Such an idea has a fitness only for the exclusive dipping dogma. It never existed any where but in the head of a Baptist. The Holy Ghost, who inspired good men to write the oracles of God, never conceived it. Then the verse as altered by Baptists does not make good sense, and is contrary to Scriptural matter of fact; for the Holy Ghost is uniformly represented as being poured out, as coming down, and as being shed forth upon us; and we are never said to be immersed into the Holy Ghost. When John said: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," he foretold what took place on the day of Pentecost; and the fulfilment of it contradicts the Baptist version. On the day of Pentecost "there appeared unto them cloven tongues as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were filled with the Holy Ghost." Acts ii. 3, 4. This is the fulfilment of what John foretold. Here, then, the Holy Ghost is represented as sitting upon them as cloven tongues of fire, and filling them, but not a word about

immersion into the Holy Spirit. But hold, says a certain objector, who started in front of the battle on last summer, but who soon fell back as aid to Mr. F., the Holy Ghost filled the house where they were, and of course they were immersed. Not quite so fast, sir. It is said in the second verse of the same chapter, that, "there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and *it* (the sound) filled all the house where they were sitting." Then it was the sound in which they were immersed, if immersed at all. The Holy Ghost may have accompanied the sound in its descent from Heaven, but there is a vast difference between the sound which filled the house, and the Holy Ghost who sat upon them as cloven tongues of fire, and filled them.

None of the above objections will lie, in any force, against the idea of baptism by pouring or sprinkling. Such an idea is perfectly compatible with the numbers baptized —with the decency of the ordinance, under the circumstances, and with John's own account of his own baptism. But the idea of immersion is incompatible with all these. The case, then, stands thus: There is no positive evidence that he sprinkled the people, or that he poured water upon them, or that he immersed them. But it is circumstantially certain that he did not immerse them.

But it is said, that John baptized in Jordan, Mark i. 9, and, therefore, he must have immersed the people. So it is said that he baptized in the wilderness. Did he then immerse or plunge the people into the wilderness? So it is said he baptized in Bethabara beyond Jordan, or Bethany, as the best critics agree it should read. Then did he plunge them into Bethany? So it is said he baptized in Enon near to Salim. Now, Enon is a town on the west side of Jordan; did he, then, immerse the people into the town? What, then, are we to understand by the above expressions? Nothing more than the designation of the place *where* John administered baptism. One circumstance related of Christ goes very far to prove this. In Acts x. 40, it is said; "and Jesus went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John first baptized and there he abode." Surely, then, John did not first baptize either in a river or in a pool; for Christ would hardly take up his residence in such a place as that. It is certain, then, that the above expressions refer to the places,—as to towns, or parts of the country, *where* John performed the rite of baptism, and not to *the mode in which* he performed it.

But our Baptist brethren will object and say; that in Mark i. 9, where it is said: "that Jesus was baptized by

John in Jordan; the Greek preposition εις (eis) and the accusative Ιορδανην (Jordanen) are used with βαπτιζω (baptizo) thus, Ιησους...εβαπτισθη υπο Ιωανου εις τον Ιορδανην, and that this is the usual and correct expression for immersion into an element. Very well; I am willing to grant them this, if they will stick to it; for there is not another like expression in the New Testament, and, of course, not another from which they can infer immersion, according to the rule here laid down. In every other instance where the baptism of John, or of Christ and his disciples, is spoken of, and where the element made use of in order to perform the rite, is named, that element is put in the dative case with the preposition εν either expressed or understood. Thus Matt. iii. 11, "I baptize you εν υδατι, *with water, or by water.*" Mark, i. 5, "and were all baptized of him, εν τω Ιορδανη, *in Jordan*, or *with Jordan, i. e.* the water of Jordan. And so Mark i. 8. Luke iii. 16. Acts i. 5.—xi. 16. The same where the baptism of the children of Israel is spoken of, 1 Cor. x. 2, &c. Here, then, is a dilemma. If our Baptist brethren hold on to the Scripture in Mark i. 9, as proving immersion, ex vi termini—i. e. from the force of the expression; then they cut themselves off from every other scripture where the element of baptism is spoken of, and take that as the only one of all this class of scriptures, which will prove immersion; thus virtually granting that all the other scriptures as quoted must, ex vi termini, prove some other mode. If they are unwilling to this; then they must give up their hold upon Mark i. 9, and let that come in, and be construed according to the analogy of other scriptures, which designate the place where, or the element with which John baptized, and not the mode. In either case their system, as built upon John, must fall to the ground. For if they hold on to Mark i. 9, as proving immersion; then by the rule which they adopt to secure them there, they are compelled to give up every other text in the whole history of John's baptism, as proving some other mode; and here the odds is fearfully against them. Or, if to avoid this difficulty, they give up their strong hold in Mark, then they are left wandering about, high and dry, over the whole region of evidence, without a river or a pool to hide themselves in; for wherever baptism is spoken of, especially in the history of John's baptism, and the element is mentioned, it is invariably put in the dative case with the preposition εν (en,) except in Mark i. 9, as already specified. Now, the dative case with the εν (en,) is not used to express the element *into* which an immersion is made, but the instrument, matter, or element, with which baptism is performed.

But suppose that the expression—"in Jordan"—was the only expression casting any light upon John's baptism. It could not from hence be proved that John practised immersion. It is a well ascertained fact, that the Jordan has inner and outer banks; that at some seasons of the year, it rises and spreads to its outer banks. Now, any point within these outer banks may correctly be said to be in the Jordan. John, no doubt, performed baptism on some occasions within these banks; hence it is correctly said that he baptized in Jordan, though he may not have immersed one. It is probable that he baptized and preached about the inner bank, as shade was there convenient, sometimes, and it may be generally, going down to the water to obtain the element for baptism. This is the more probable conclusion; for I have already shown, that it was utterly impracticable for John to have immersed the multitudes that flocked to his ministry.

But Mr. Furman relies with much confidence on the passage in John iii. 23. "John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there." He thinks it very strange, that any one should think that John chose a place of "much water," or many waters as the original has it, as the scene of his ministry and baptism, in order that the multitudes who flocked to hear him, and their beasts of burden might have water to drink, and use otherwise. Indeed, on the very first glance which Mr. F. takes at the text, he makes a very important discovery, viz. that "the text tells us nothing about camels." Very well. At this point I, too, have made a discovery equally important, viz., that the text tells us as much about camels, as it does about immersion. It is true it speaks of baptism; but mere immersion abstractly considered, is no more scriptural baptism, than a camel is. But I have made another important discovery, viz., that "John was baptizing," not *at* the "much water," nor *in* the water, but *in Enon—in the town.* Now, as Enon was not a large town, it is not probable that the "much water, or many waters spoken of, were in it, but round about, and near it. Then as John baptized "in Enon," and not *in* the water, nor *at* the water, the inference is that the water was brought, and he baptized where he preached; and that the expression—"because there was much water there"—relates to the necessary supply of the multitude and their beasts of burden. But this strange notion, that camels were there, and probably horses and donkies, too, and that they would drink a good deal of water, seems to trouble Mr. F., and he tries very hard to rid the occasion of them. Hence he says: "We do not know whether the people who went to be bap-

tized of John, carried any animals with them." True, we do not *know;* but as people knew how to ride in those days, the fair presumption is, that all who went any distance, rode, just as they were accustomed to do on other occasions, and just as people would do now-a-days. But if Mr. F. is compelled to admit that "animals" were there, he don't intend that they shall have a drop of the "much water" spoken of. He argues, that "as much corn and provender were also necessary" for them. and as there is no mention of them, the "much water" spoken of could not be for them, for, says he, "they could not live upon water alone." Pity but this doctrine of not living upon water alone, were generally inculcated by our Baptist brethren upon their proselytes and others, who seem to think that their chief dependence for spiritual life here, and eternal life hereafter, is in the water. But any child that has ever gone with his father and mother to camp-meeting, will tell Mr. F., that, on such occasions, people carry their corn and provender with them, always expecting to find plenty of water at, or near, the place of meeting. But Mr. F. can see no propriety in all this notion of drinking, and otherwise using water for common purposes. He says, the much water was needed, "in order that John might immerse the people," page 17. Is Mr. F. serious in saying, that "*much* water" was necessary for immersion? I hope not. A single bath, or a little preparation in a small stream, would be sufficient for all the purposes of immersion. The question still stands unanswered. Why was much water needed? The true answer is, that it was needed for the supply of the vast multitudes, and their beasts of burden. This answer satisfies the question; for the coming together of so many people would require a place of much water; while every body knows that much water is not required for immersion.

No set of men would locate a camp-ground,—no general would fix on an encampment for his army, except at a place well watered; and it is not to be supposed that John would be less provident in this matter.

In 2d Chron. xxxii. 1, 4, a circumstance is related which may throw some light on this subject. Sennacherib went to invade Jerusalem; but Hezekiah stopped the waters of the fountains which were without the city, saying: "why should the kings of Assyria come and find much water?" Now, why was much water necessary for the Assyrian army? For the same reason that much water was necessary for the multitudes that flocked to John's baptism.

Again: in the original it does not read, "much water,"

but, "many waters;" that is, there were many waters, such as springs and rivulets round about Enon, making it just such a place as any prudent man would choose for the accommodation of a multitude assembled together for several days,—more or less,—for religious worship.

III. But whether John baptized by immersion or not, is of but little importance to us; for his baptism was not the Christian baptism.

1. In the days of John's baptism, and until after the baptism of Christ, there was no christian institution appointed. John did not receive his commission from Christ, but from the Father. He says: "And I knew him (Christ) not, but he, (the Father) that sent me to baptize with water, said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending," &c., "the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." * Then, John did not even know Christ while he was preaching and baptizing; but he went forward under the commission of the Father as the forerunner of Christ, preaching and baptizing that Christ might be made manifest. How, then, could John's be the christian baptism, when he was not commissioned by Christ, and when he did not even know Christ until about the end of his ministry and baptism, and when, as yet, there was no christian institution appointed?

2. If John's baptism was the christian baptism, then, he would have made Christians of all whom he baptized. So that, when Christ entered upon his ministry, the whole country would have been filled with Christians; for it is said, John baptized all Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan. Then Christ, at the start, would have had hundreds of thousands of followers. But was this the case? Not at all. They stood aloof from him, as if they knew as little about him as John did when he baptized them. Strange Christians, these disciples of John! The very first thing we hear of them, they are disputing with the Jews about baptism, and wherever you find them to this day, they are full of the same spirit.

3. John's own account of his baptism and dispensation proves that his was not the christian baptism. When he was told that Christ was baptizing, and that all men went to him; the whole drift of his reply goes to show, that his baptism and dispensation were about to end. He says, "He (Christ) must increase, but I must decrease." John iii. 30. What does this mean? Why just what has come to pass, viz: that Christ's dispensation and baptism have continued from that day, and that his kingdom is still in-

* John i. 33.

creasing; and that John's dispensation and baptism, having accomplished their end, then ceased. For, when John heard that Christ was baptizing, he, from that day, never baptized any other person, nor did his disciples, from first to last, ever baptize any. Well did John say, then, "I must decrease."

4. John's baptism was merely the baptism of repentance, requiring the people to believe on him that was to come. It was never administered in the name of Christ, for, as yet, John knew him not. Can that be christian baptism, which was not administered in the name of Christ?

Robert Hall, the celebrated Baptist minister of England, says: it is an incomprehensible mystery to him, how John's baptism can be a christian ordinance, when it was not founded on the authority of Christ, and executed by one who knew him not.

5. The testimony of Christ concerning John, goes to show, that he did not belong to the christian dispensation. He says: "verily, verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater prophet than John: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." Mat. xi. 11. Then, John was greater than any of the prophets who preceded him; because he was the prophet or minister of a brighter dispensation than any that had gone before. They prophesied of Christ as yet to come. He announced the fulfilment of their prophecies, and proclaimed, that Christ was at hand. He was honored to see him; and testify, that he is the Son of God. But the least, the most inconsiderable, minister in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than John. By the kingdom of Heaven, here is meant, as all agree, the church of Christ, or the fulness of the christian dispensation. Why is he that is least in this kingdom greater than John? Because he lives in a more glorious dispensation, and enjoys higher privileges. He can point to the complete fulfilment of prophecy in reference to Christ; to the atonement made for the redemption of the world, by the suffering and death of Christ, and to Christ, as yet living, to make intercession for his people. Then, the testimony of Jesus Christ, himself, concerning John, is, that his was not the christian dispensation. How, then, could his baptism be the christian baptism? The notion is utterly preposterous. And yet our Baptist brethren build upon John. Surely, they must have a great passion for musty antiquity, thus to claim a radical connection with a time and dispensation anterior to the christian dispensation.

6. Without any of the preceding arguments, I might

safely have relied on the argument furnished in Acts xix, to prove that John's baptism was not the christian baptism. Here is the scripture as it reads there. 1. "And it came to pass, that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples,"

2 "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost."

3. "And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said unto John's baptism."

4. "Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus."

5. "And when they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

6. "And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied."

7. "And all the men were about twelve."

Here is a plain, unequivocal, declaration that the twelve disciples whom Paul found at Ephesus, and who had received John's baptism, were baptized again. Why were they baptized again? because, as Paul told them, John's was only the baptism of repentance, requiring them to believe on him that was to come: that is, that John's was not the christian baptism. And, when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus: that is, they received christian baptism. This was right, for having embraced Christianity they ought to have had a baptism appropriate to their profession. Now, if John's baptism was the same as christian baptism, would Paul have trifled with the sacred ordinance, so far as to double it upon these disciples by rebaptizing them? I need not wait for an answer. The above facts are fully sufficient to settle, forever, the question concerning John's baptism, against our opponents. Of this Mr. Furman is aware, and, as there is no way to get round it, he boldly marches up, and flatly denies that these disciples were rebaptized. Thus he flatly contradicts the word of God. What presumption! Mr. Furman "*of Cheraw*, against the inspired Luke!! Rather a fearful issue for a mere man to take. And it is matter of astonishment, that any conscientious man of Mr. Furman's pretensions should place himself in such an attitude. But this only proves what I have already said; that he takes his stand with the seeming intention of bend-

ing, or, if need be, of breaking down, every thing thereto, with the iron arm of arbitrary power.

I am not at all surprized that Mr. F. attempts to hide his true position, under the rotten covering of a few flimsy sentences which he throws together, in the shape of what, I suppose, he would call an argument. But of all the miserable "quibbling," and crude jargon, that I ever saw, as coming from a man of Mr. F.'s pretensions, I put his pseudo arguments on this point, at the climax; and I would fain be spared the pains of exposing their utter fallacy, for I am heartily tired of such work. But to the task.

He says: "it is not all impossible nor improbable that the 5th verse is the language of St. Paul, in reference to those who heard the preaching of John." That is, Mr. F. holds, that after Paul had instructed these twelve disciples at Ephesus, by telling them, in the 4th verse, that John "verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him, which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus;" he still continued speaking to them in the 5th verse saying: "when they (that is the multitudes that John had addressed and baptized years before) heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Thus, according to Mr. F., the very people, who, in the 4th verse are said to have received from John the baptism of repentance, are the same people, who, in the 5th verse, are said to have been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Thus Mr. F. makes one verse contradict the other; for, in the 4th verse the true account of John's baptism is given, as the baptism of repentance and faith on him that was to come.

In the 5th verse, if Mr. F. be right, the same John is administering baptism to the same people in the name of the Lord Jesus. Now, how could John baptize people in the name of the Lord Jesus as having come, and, at the same time require the same people to believe on him as yet to come? The fact is, John never baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; for he says. "I knew him not," nor did he know him until about the close of his dispensation; then how could he baptize in his name?

Again: in the 6th verse of the same chapter, it is said: "And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."

Now, who were they upon whom Paul thus laid his hands? Certainly, they were those very persons, who, in the 5th verse are said to have been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. But Mr. F. holds that those whose bap-

tism is spoken of in the 5th verse, were the multitudes whom John baptized in Jordan and Enon, &c., thirty years before. But how could Paul lay his hands on them? They were not at Ephesus at that time. The last we hear of them, they were with John about Jordan and Enon. Then, did they wait there for thirty years for the laying on of Paul's hands.

Again: Ephesus, the place at which Paul was at this time, is some eight hundred miles from Jordan and Enon. Then did Paul stretch his arms over the space of eight hundred miles, to reach these multitudes about Jordan and Enon who had been waiting there for thirty years for the laying on of his hands? To these absurd results Mr. Furman's position leads. Such absurdities we may generally look for, when men "deny" the plain declarations of Scripture, and turn themselves loose upon the open field of wild conjecture. Away with such perfect, unmitigated nonsense! The Rev. Robert Hall, to whom allusion has already been made, says: that the very postion which Mr. F. here takes is, *ineffably absurd*; and he unanswerably argues, that John's baptism was not the christian baptism.

And, I am sure, that I am equally as glad of the testimony of Mr. Hall on this question, as Mr. F. can possibly be of the testimony of John Calvin.

But Mr. Furman, in order to escape the absurd bearing of his position, as above, may say, that the persons on whom, it is said in the 6th verse, St. Paul laid his hands, were not the same as those mentioned in the 5th verse; but any school-boy that can understand the relation between sentences, and trace the connection between pronouns and their antecedents, would correct such an error.

In the next paragraph Mr. F. says:

"But even if we admit, that these disciples were baptized again, it will not destroy the validity of John's baptism." page 15.

To sustain himself in the above position, Mr. F. takes the ground, that, "in all probability," these twelve disciples at Ephesus, were baptized, not by John, but by some of his disciples, who had failed to give them proper instruction relative to the Holy Ghost. Hence the necessity of their being rebaptized. But, unfortunately for Mr. F., the premises from which he argues to his favorite conclusion, are false. Where is the proof that the disciples of John ever baptized any? Neither Mr. F. nor any other advocate of his system ever did, or ever can, produce any evi- of such a fact. When Mr. F. wishes to arrive at a certain conclusion, he is very fruitful in the invention of premises,

from which to argue to such a conclusion. But in the present instance his invention is too disingenuous to bear even a slight inspection. We, then, deny his premises, and demand the proof. But stay! Mr. F. says, "it is not *improbable*," that John's disciples baptized these twelve at Ephesus. Indeed! Then, I suppose, that from premises merely *probable*, we are to argue to a fact *certain*. I hardly think that such sophistry can benefit the cause of Mr. F.

But, on the same page, Mr. F. argues, that the twelve at Ephesus, were probably baptized, at first, by some of John's disciples, in as much as they were not properly instructed in reference to the Holy Ghost. He says, they "declared, that they *had never heard of a Holy Ghost*." In this Mr. F. is again incorrect. They made no such declaration. When asked if they had received the Holy Ghost, they replied, "we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Any, and all, of John's disciples might, properly, have made the same reply, at any time before they knew that the Holy Ghost had descended according to the prediction of John. Although, at their baptism by John, they had all heard *of* the Holy Ghost as yet to come, yet, before they had knowledge of his coming, they might have said with propriety, "we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost;" that is as having come, according to the prediction, as a baptism from on high. And this is all the disciples at Ephesus meant by their reply, as given above. They never said, and did not mean, that they had never heard *of* a Holy Ghost, as the circumstances prove. If this had been their meaning, then St. Paul would certainly have given them some instruction concerning the Holy Ghost,—how he had been spoken of by John, &c. But they, having been thus instructed before, St. Paul says not a word of this kind, but proceeds to lay his hands on them, that they might receive the fulfilment of that prediction which they heard at their baptism by John. And they did receive it; for the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spoke with tongues, and prophesied.

Let me here notice another of Mr. Furman's blunders. In one paragraph, as quoted above, he flatly denies that these disciples at Ephesus were re-baptized. This denial is, of course, founded upon the supposition and belief, that they had been validly baptized by John, as they said. But in the very next paragraph, upon the supposition that they were rebaptized, he labours hard to show a necessity for that re-baptism, from the assumed fact that they were invalidly baptized by some of John's disciples. Thus his

paragraphs mutually destroy each other. Such are Mr. Furman's blunders, his inconsistency and sophistry, in attempting to support a contradiction of the Bible.

Since writing the above, I have noticed in Mr. Furman's pamphlet, p. 16, another argument of his to prove that John's baptism was the christian baptism. He takes it from Acts xviii. 25. "This man (Apollos) was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he taught and spake diligently, the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John." A more unfortunate text for Mr. Furman's cause could not be found in the Bible. Notice the expression—"knowing *only* John's baptism." This most manifestly implies, that there was another baptism besides John's, and that his had gone out of use, and that this other, that is, the christian baptism was now in general use. And so remarkable was the fact, that this man, Apollos, should be teaching the things of God, while, as yet, he knew only John's baptism, that the sacred historian thinks it worthy of record. The thing was uncommon; for all of John's disciples who embraced Christianity, received christian baptism, as did the twelve disciples at Ephesus mentioned in xix. chap. of Acts. And by the by; what did the question of St. Paul imply, when he asked those twelve disciples,—"Unto what then were ye baptized?" It could only imply, that there was another baptism besides John's in common use, which those who embraced Christianity were in the habit of receiving. Upon no other supposition could his question have the merit of common sense.

Mr. F. says, there is no account that Apollos was ever rebaptized. Neither is there any account that he was not rebaptized. But in the very next verse it is said, that Aquilla and Priscilla expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly; and there is but little doubt, but that he, upon learning the way of the Lord more perfectly, received christian baptism, unto which that more perfect instruction would lead; just as the twelve disciples at Ephesus did.

IV. Though Christ was baptized by John, yet he did not receive John's baptism.

1. John's baptism was a baptism of repentance; therefore only repenting sinners could receive it. Christ was not a sinner. He had nothing to repent of. Then, although, he was baptized by John, he did not receive the baptism of repentance; therefore he did not receive John's baptism.

2. John's baptism required faith in him that was to come.

Christ himself was that very personage. He was the object of faith. Then he could not have had the faith that John required of his subjects; therefore, we say again, he did not receive John's baptism.

From the above considerations, those who contend that Christ received John's baptism proper, make Christ a repenting sinner, and represent him as believing on himself as yet to come. Moreover, they make Christ the disciple of John; and as the disciple is inferior to his master, they make Christ inferior to John.

V. Christ did not intend his baptism as an example for Christians.

1. When Christ came to John to be baptized, John was astonished, and said: "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" Christ answered: "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." As though he had said, "I do not come to you for that baptism which you administer to guilty men, but rather for that which is required in the law of the priests consecration, recorded in Exod. xxix. 4, which requires the bodies of the priests to be washed in water, and which all the priests of the Lord have received before me. Before I abolish the law, it behooves me to fulfil it in all its parts." Not a word about "*example*." If Christ had intended his baptism as an example for his followers, his reply to John would have been very different. He, doubtless, would have said, "Suffer it to be so now," for I am about to set a living example for all my followers down to the end of time. When he instituted the Holy Eucharist, he explicitly said: "Do this in remembrance of me." Now, if Christ had intended his baptism as a living example, according to the Baptist notion, he certainly would have been as explicit in the one case as the other. Then Christ gave the true reason why he was baptized, but our baptist brethren try to make out another, quite different from the one which he gave.

2. Christ did not intend his baptism as an example for Christians; for he did not receive the christian baptism. 1. Christian baptism, in the case of adults, is administered to such as have repented and believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, or to such as are repenting and believing. As already shown, Christ was not a sinner, nor could he repent as a sinner. He could not believe as a sinner, for he himself was the object of faith. 2. Christian baptism is administered in the name of the Holy Trinity. Christ could not be baptized in his own name. 3. Christian baptism is the putting on of Christ; that is, publicly taking upon our-

selves the christian profession. Christ could not put on himself. 4. Christian baptism is the door into the christian church. Now, there was no christian church in existence when Christ was baptized. And to say, that Christ's baptism was to him the door into the christian church, would be to say, that the christian church existed before Christ founded or instituted it. 5. Christian baptism is an outward washing or purification, representing the internal cleansing or purification of the Holy Ghost. Now, this could not be the intention of Christ's baptism; for he was not impure, that he needed this internal operation of the Holy Ghost. We find, then, that so far as the requirements and end of baptism are concerned, Christ's baptism differs from christian baptism, in every particular. How, then, could he have intended his baptism as an example for us? Nor did he intend his baptism an an example for John's disciples; for most of the vast multitudes that flocked to John's baptism were baptized before Christ. Then, in priority of time, they were Christ's exemplars, if there was any example intended. Nor may it be said, that Christ was baptized to confirm their baptism; for as we have already proved, Christ did not receive John's baptism; then his baptism, in every particular, was essentially different from theirs. We find, then, gentle reader, that Christ's baptism materially differed in every single important particular, both from John's baptism proper, and from christian baptism proper. It, then, transcends all human reason to suppose, that he intended his baptism as an example either for John's disciples, or for Christians.

3. Christ's baptism, as we shall presently show, was a jewish rite, in accordance with the ceremonial law; and not a christian ordinance, as we have already shown. Then, if we follow him as an exemplar in one of his legal observances, to be consistent, we must follow him in all. Then, let our Baptist brethren have their children circumcised at eight days old, for Christ was circumcised at that age. Let them go up to Jerusalem yearly, as the law required, for so did Christ. Let them keep the feast of tabernacles, and the feast of the passover, for so did Christ. Let them wait untill they are thirty years old before they are baptized, for so did Christ. Yes, brethren, come up to the mark of consistency; for there is as much reason that we follow Christ in one of his legal observances as in another; for he has left the point at large—not having enjoined any as an example. But no. In all these respects you beg to be excused.

But if our Baptist brethren please, I would suggest to

them, that there are many important particulars in which Christ was our exemplar. He was meek. He was not given to evil-speaking. He went about doing good. He laboured to convert sinners from the error of their ways, &c. If Christians, and especially christian ministers, would follow his example in these respects; then there would be more zealous effort for the salvation of sinners. There would be less strife in Israel, and less sneaking and skirting about privately, and around places where there are revivals of religion, with the low-bred and unworthy design of proselyting. Whoever has observed the progress and history of revivals, in this part of the country, for the last fifteen months, will know that I do not speak at random or without cause. No longer ago than Tuesday of last week, a camp-meeting closed ten miles below this place, and on the Thursday following, a meeting was commenced in an out-house, not half a mile from the encampment; the object of which all seemed to understand; for the Lord was graciously present at the camp-meeting, and it resulted in much good fruit. And even now while I am writing, there is a meeting going on in a vacant house, near the borders of this village, with the express design, as I have no doubt, of proselyting. I mention these as simple instances of what is implied in the above remarks; and I intend all this paragraph as peculiarly applicable to this part of the country.

The question now properly recurs; why was Christ baptized? It may be answered, that he was baptized as "the high priest of our profession," Heb. iii. 1. His baptism was his public consecration to the office and work upon which he was about to enter, and in accordance with that law of the priesthood recorded in Exodus, xxix. 4, which required the bodies of the priests to be washed with water, by which, with other ceremonies, they were publicly set apart for the office of the priesthood.

1. This is evident from the conversation which took place between John and Christ at his baptism. John knew that he could not baptize Christ as a repenting sinner, hence he, at first, objected. But when Christ informed him that it became him "to fulfil all righteousness," John seems to have understood, that the design of his baptism was different from the common design of baptism, and he baptized him. Now, the question is, what righteousness did Christ fulfil in his baptism? It was not the righteousness of faith. In a word; in the whole range of theology, there is no other righteousness, which he, by that act, could have appropriately fulfiled, but the righteousness, or re-

quirement of the law above mentioned. Says a learned commentator, "It was necessary," (that Christ should thus be baptized according to the ceremonial law) for "our Lord represented the high priest, and was to be the high priest over the house of God: now as the high priest was initiated into his office by *washing* and *anointing*, so must Christ; and hence he was baptized, washed, and anointed, by the Holy Ghost. Thus he fulfiled the righteous ordinance of his initiation into the office of priest, and thus was prepared to make an atonement for the sins of mankind."

2. In John i. 31, it is said by John the Baptist. "And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." That is as if he had said; I am come publicly baptizing with water, that he coming to my baptism, should be shown to be what he is, by some signal from heaven; and that he might be publicly manifested as the great high priest of the christian profession.

3. Christ was baptized at about thirty years old—the very age at which jewish priests were baptized and publicly consecrated to their office, according to the law. Now, why did Christ wait until this age, if it was not in conformity to the prevailing law of the priesthood? No other reason can be given.

4. To put the matter beyond all dispute, St. Paul says: that Christ was made under the law "to redeem them that were under the law." So we find that at eight days old he was circumcised according to the law." He went up to Jerusalem annually according to the law. He observed the jewish feasts according to the law. He was baptized at thirty years old according to the law of the priesthood; and the last public act of his life was the celebration of a legal feast. So that we find he was not only made under the law, but he observed and fulfiled the law, at least in all the above respects, until by his death, he abolished the law. But why was it so? The answer is plain in the words of St. Paul: "that he might redeem them that were under the law." Then, it is evident that his baptism was a legal act—a legal observance, and of course never intended as an example for his followers, since the law which required it, was abolished by his death.

To the above proposition, Mr. Furman makes several objections, which I shall briefly notice. They can be found on pages 17 and 18.

1. "He was not a priest after the order of men, but after the order of Melchizidec." Very well. We have

no objections to this. All that the apostle meant by telling us that he is "a priest forever after the order of Melchizidec," is, that as Melchizidec did not descend from any line of ancestral priesthood, so Christ did not descend from the Aaronic priesthood; and as Melchizidec was "a priest without beginning of days or end of life; so Christ's priesthood should never end. But what has all this to do with his baptism? Just nothing at all. This is all perfectly compatible with the idea of his fulfilling the righteousness of the ceremonial law.

2. But says Mr. F. "We no where read that Melchizidec was baptized. And why should Christ be?" He might as well say, we no where read that Melchizidec was circumcised, and why should Christ be. The fact is, Christ was both circumcised and baptized, and both, doubtless, in accordance with the ceremonial law, as stated above. I might retort upon Mr. F. and say: we no where read that Melchizidec was baptized as an example for any body to follow; and why should Christ be? The fact is, the points of resemblance between the priesthood of Melchizidec and Christ, do not extend to these things. The two great points of resemblance between them are those which I have mentioned above. So the apostle teaches.

3. Again, Mr. F. says: "it would have been a violation of the ceremonial law for him to have partaken of any of the ceremonies peculiar to the levitical priesthood." This is positively contradicted by St. Paul, who expressly says: "he was made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law;" and by the fact, that he did live under the law, until by his death he abolished it.

4. Again, Mr. F. quotes from Hebrews vii. "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law." Very good. When St. Paul wrote this, Christ had accomplished the work of redemption on the cross—risen from the dead, and ascended into heaven. Hence the priesthood was at this time changed, and the law, both sacrificial and ceremonial was correspondingly changed; or rather both abolished. Now, what has this to do with the baptism of Christ? It only shows that the law under which he received that baptism is abolished, and, of course, the baptism with it; therefore his baptism can be no example for Christians to follow.

Again: "There ariseth another priest, (Christ) who is made, *not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.*" Very good. Christ did not come into the priesthood by any line of carnal descent, upon the vacancy created by the death of some preceding

priest; but he came in, at his own proper time, according to the will of God, not having descended from priestly ancestors, to continue a high priest forever. Hence he is made a priest "after the power of an endless life." All this does not affect the case of his legal baptism.

Mr. Furman thinks we have obtained our notions on this subject from Dr. Adam Clarke. In this he is mistaken. We get them from the Bible. As to his remarks relative to Dr. Clarke, I need say nothing. The world knows Dr. Clarke. And his fame could be advanced as little, by any effort of mine, as it can be injured by the efforts of Mr. Furman. As a scholar, as a Christian, as a profound theologian, his fame shall live in morning freshness, when the names of those, who falsely say he "contradicts the Scriptures, and dishonours and degrades the incarnate Redeemer, by making him a priest after the order of Aaron," shall rot in the shades of oblivion.

In conclusion on this point, I will only remark that others in this part of the country have caught Mr. Furman's bright idea, and publicly proclaim that we do make Jesus Christ a jewish priest. Not a great while ago, a certain minister, I need not say of what denomination, I will only say, he very often looks wiser than he speaks, publicly declared in this village, that we make Christ nothing more than a jewish priest. To contradict such statements is a perfect waste of breath, so far as the publishers of them are concerned. With a "dogged pertinacity," they will continue to publish them just as though they were true; excusing themselves by saying they cannot see how else it can be. Really one does not know which most to wonder at; their hopeless stolidity, or their aptness at misrepresentation.

Again: our Baptist brethren rely with much confidence upon what is related of the baptism of the Ethiopian "eunuch," to prove immersion. The Scripture reads thus: "and he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," &c., Acts viii. 38, 39. They generally rely upon the expressions "into," and "out of the water," to prove the immersion of the eunuch. Admit that the translation is correct and still a clear case of immersion cannot be made out of the language; for, as before remarked, every man almost, has, hundreds of times, gone down into the water, and come up out of it, without going under it, or being immersed in it. Then the language does not necessarily imply immersion. Such expressions are common in the scriptures where immersion is utterly out of

the question. For instance, it is said, that Christ "went up *into* a mountain." But that does not mean, that he went *under* the mountain.

Again: when our Baptist brethren predicate the immersion of the eunuch, of the expressions, "into" and "out of the water," they show that Philip was immersed as well as the eunuch. For "they both went down into the water," &c. Then they are both equally involved in the premises, and they must be so in the conclusion. Therefore, if the conclusion is immersion; they were both immersed. To avoid this difficulty some of our Baptist brethren shift their ground, and argue the immersion of the eunuch from the action of Philip contained in the expression, "and he baptized him." But this is nothing to the purpose; for, as has been already abundantly shown, to baptize, does not necessarily mean to immerse. He might have sprinkled him, or poured the water upon him, and, still, it would as correctly be said, "he baptized him."

If we look into the original, we shall find that the Greek preposition, *eis*, which is here translated "*into*," is very often translated *to*, to designate direction *to* a place, or *toward* it. Thus: John ii. 12, Jesus *went down to* (*eis*) Capernaum. Acts vii. 15, Jacob *went down to* (*eis*) Egypt. Acts xiv. 25, They *went down to* Attalia. Acts xvi. 8, They *went down to* (*eis*) Troas. Acts xviii. 22. He *went down to* (*eis*) Antioch. Acts xxv. 6, *Going down to* (*eis*) *Cæsarea*, &c. Indeed so common is this meaning of *eis*, when it denotes direction to a place, says Stuart, that Bretschneider has given it as its first, or leading meaning. Again: according to the best authorities the leading meaning of *ek*, which, in the text, is translated "*out of*," is *from*. Then, according to the force, and true meaning of these prepositions, the translation *to*, and *from* the water, would be equally as good as the other; and, if we consider the connection in which these prepositions stand, it is a better translation. The original expression is, κατεβησαν αμφοτεροι εις τω ὑδωρ. Here we find εις connected with the verb of motion, καταβαίνω. Now, professor Stuart has abundantly shown, that this verb with εις, is generally used in the New Testament to indicate the action performed in going down to a place, or the approximation *to* it by descent, real or imaginary, and not the entrance *into* it. "This conclusion is rendered nearly certain by the exact counterpart, or antithesis, of this expression, found in the 39th verse viii. Acts, where, after the baptism, it is said, ανεβησαν εκ του ὑδατος, *they went up from the water.*" Now, as αναβαινω is never employed in the sense of *emerging* from a liquid substance, the above expression only im-

plies that they went up, or ascended, the bank of the stream, pool, or fountain. "As, then, *to go up* FROM the water, is to ascend the bank of the stream, fountain, &c., so to *go down to* the water, is only to go down the bank of such stream, fountain, &c., and to come to the water." Then, according to the force and true meaning of the original, the translation *to* the water, and *from* the water, would be better than *into*, and *out of* the water, as it now stands.

Professor Stuart farther says, that "εισερχομαι is the appropriate word for *entering into*; or rather (in distinction from καταβαινω) εμβαινω is the appropriate word to signify entrance *into* any place or thing." In this the usage of the New Testament bears the Professor out. And I would here remark that "it is a correct general rule among Greek writers, that when they intend to express motion into a place they double the preposition εις, using it before the verb of motion, and also before the word denoting the place into which the motion is performed. Εις is universally used before the noun, and the same preposition, or one of similar import, before the verb of motion." In the New Testament this rule is rarely, if at all, violated. When the sacred writers wish to express motion to a place, they use εις before the noun to which, or towards which, the motion is exerted. When they wish to express motion *into* a place or thing, they double the preposition as above said. For example. Acts xvi. 40, εισηλθον εις τη Λυδιαν, "*they went into the house of Lydia.* Acts iii. 8, και εισηλθε συν αυτοις εις το ἱερον. "*And he entered with them into the temple.*" Acts v. 21, εισηλθον ὑπο τον ορθρον εις το ἱερον, "*They entered into the temple early in the morning.*" Acts ix. 6, Αναστηθι και εισελθε εις την πολιν, "*Arise, and go into the city.* Acts ix. 17, Απηλθε δε Ανανιας και εισηλθεν εις την οικιαν, "*And Ananias went his way and entered into his house.*" Acts xi. 12, και εισελθομεν εις τον οικον, "*And we entered into the house of the man.*" Such examples from the New Testament might be greatly multiplied; all going to show the correctness of the rule laid down. This mode of expression was common, too, with the Greek classics. Examples of which any one may find by consulting Aristophanes. Plut. line 237, 242.

If we apply this rule to the case of Philip and the eunuch, we cannot even get them *into* the water, and much less *under* it. There the preposition is not doubled. It is only used before the noun—water. Again: The verb of motion which is there used, is not that verb which is commonly used to express motion *into* a place. It, as already shown, only expresses motion *to*, or *towards*, a place. Then according to the force and genius of the Greek language, to

which Mr. F. appeals with so much confidence, it is impossible that he can make any thing like a clear case of immersion out of the baptism of the eunuch. But Mr. F. declares that this passage "*will preach immersion to the end of time.*" So it may to him, and to those who are determined to hear nothing else. Their ears are set to this sound only, and have no sympathy with any other. But not so of all. The great majority of the Christian world are willing to hear the clear deductions of reason, and the voice of revelation as explained by the best rules of interpretation. To the jaundiced eye every thing looks yellow. And to the eye of an exclusive immersionist, every thing looks watery.

The next, and last strong hold of our Baptist brethren, which I shall notice, is Rom. vi. 4. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, we also should walk in newness of life." Here they argue, that "buried with Christ by baptism into death," has reference to the mode of baptism, and that the mode is immersion, representing the burial and resurrection of Christ. But this exposition of the passage will not bear the test of close examination.

1. If we follow the notion of our Baptist friends, and take "*buried with him by baptism*," to signify literal immersion, we must also take the balance of the clause, "into death," in a literal sense. And I beg the reader to remember, that the passage reads, "buried with him by baptism," not into the water, but, "*into* DEATH." Then let the passage be taken literally, as our Baptist friends are compelled to do, according to their exposition of it, and it will involve a result which they may not relish so well. It will compel them to baptize their subjects *into death*; or so to immerse them that death will be the result. Yes, if literal immersion, then literal death.

2. In the verse before us there is an antithesis so plain, that it may not be overlooked. In the former part a burial is spoken of, and in the latter part a resurrection is spoken of as its antithesis. Well, one part of the antithesis cannot be taken in a literal sense, and the other in a spiritual sense. If we make the former part of the antithesis mean literal immersion, or baptism in a physical sense; there is no such physical idea in the latter part to answer to it. The resurrection there spoken of is a *moral*, or *spiritual* one. If we turn to Col. ii. 12, a parallel passage, we shall find that this resurrection is said to be "by faith," clearly showing that it is a *moral* or spiritual one; for

people are not raised out of the water by faith, but by the arm that immersed them. As, then, the latter part of the antithesis is to be taken in a *moral* or *spiritual* sense only, so must the former part be taken. Hence the literal or physical idea of immersion is excluded from the text.

3. As has already been said, there is nowhere to be found a particle of evidence to prove that baptism was ever intended to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ. St. Paul could have had no such idea of baptism. Ananias said unto him, "arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Then, he could only have regarded baptism as a symbolical cleansing or washing away of his sins,—as the outward sign of an inward purification,—as an emblem of *purity*, and not an emblem of the grave, which is full of all corruption and loathsomeness. Then, the very touching sentiment, which we so often hear, about the "liquid grave," the "watery tomb," &c., is a modern invention,—a fond conceit, without any authority from the word of God. But, says Mr. Furman, baptism in this passage "represents the believer's death to sin, and his resurrection to a new and holy life," page 23. Here Mr. F. has shifted his ground. In another part of his sermon he says, baptism is an emblem of Christ's grave. And, from the very language of the verse in question, if literal immersion is implied at all, it is, most assuredly, intended to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, and not the believer's death unto sin, &c., as Mr. F. inconsistently says.

4. To make the passage before us represent immersion as the mode of baptism, involves another serious difficulty; for, in the next verse, which, in meaning, stands inseparably connected with the one in question, baptism is impliedly spoken of in terms which preclude all idea of immersion. It is there (5th verse) said: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death," &c. Planted how? Why certainly by the same baptism, by which we, in the 4th verse, are said to be buried with him. Then I would ask, what mode of baptism is represented by our being "planted together in the likeness of Christ's death?" Certainly not immersion; for that is a plunging *down* into the water, but Christ was lifted *up* upon the cross. Now, how could a human body be so planted, as to represent the crucifixion of Christ? Verily not by immersion. Indeed, it would be very amusing to see Mr. Furman attempting to plant out an orchard of Baptists by immersion, so as to make them appear "in the likeness" of Christ's death upon the cross. Even if we admit that burying, as spoken of in the 4th verse, is intended to represent the mode of baptism,

it would give us but a very clumsy idea of immersion. In burying the *dead*, the body is gently placed in the grave prepared for it, and the earth is sprinkled or poured upon it until the grave is filled, and it is there left to remain. But in immersion the *living* body is plunged into the water and taken out again the same instant. Really, the burying of a dead body, to say the least of it, favours pouring and sprinkling as much as it does immersion.

In the conclusion of his remarks on the above passage, Mr. F. uses an argument, or an illustration, as he calls it, at which he seems to think, "an indignant universe will rise against us." And what, gentle reader, do you think that argument is, which is to stir the world? Here it is. "If you take a coffin to a grave that has been prepared for its reception, and sprinkle upon one end of it a handful of earth, can you say that it has been buried," &c. page 23. Certainly we could say that it is buried, with as much propriety as we could say it of a coffin that had been let down into the grave and taken up the same moment, according to the method of immersion. But I would suggest to Mr. F. an argument which may serve his cause better than the one just spoken of. An old Baptist brother, *as I heard*, said he could prove immersion to be the right mode of baptism, from the word itself. For, said he, we *bap* 'em in, and *tize* 'em out again. But another good old Baptist brother, *as I heard again*, said to his congregation, by way of improvement on the above, that he could prove immersion to be the only right mode of baptism, from the very *tomology* (etymology) of the word. For, said he, when we immerse, as the person strikes the water, it goes *bap;* and as we lift him out, the water dropping from his body into the pool, goes *tism tism tism tism.* There, said he, I have proved from the very *tomology* of the word, that immersion is the right way. Now I do earnestly recommend to Mr. F. the above improved argument, when he is again so hard run, as to be under the necessity of using the old argument about the coffin and the handful of dirt.

But seriously. In the above passages of scripture, the apostle could have had no allusion to the mode of baptism. To say that he had, destroys the meaning and the beauty of the passages, and renders them at war with themselves. The manifest design of the Apostle was to represent the death and burial, or the entire putting off the old man of sin, and the resurrection and life of the new man. Or, in other words, our mystical death unto sin, and the entire putting off, or burial of "the body of death" and sin, and our resurrection to newness of life, are fitly represented by the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. This was the

design of the apostle, and in this design there is inimitable beauty and force. If water baptism is implied at all, it is without any reference to the mode, and only as the symbol of that inward and powerful baptism from above, which, as the mighty instrument, operates in the production of the above important results.

Permit me here to quote from the very lucid exposition which Mr. Watson gives of the passage in question.

"The only argument left for the advocates of immersion is the supposed allusion contained in the words of St. Paul, Rom. vi. 3 4, 'Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we *are buried with him by baptism*, into death; that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' It is necessary, however, to quote the next verses also, which are dependent upon the foregoing, 'For if we have been PLANTED together,' still by baptism, 'in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is CRUCIFIED with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin,' v. 5–7. Why, then, do not the advocates of immersion go forward to these verses, so inseparably connected with those they are so ready to quote, and show us a resemblance, not only between baptism by immersion, and being buried with Christ; but also between immersion, and being 'planted with Christ?' If the allusion of the apostle is the planting of a young tree in the earth, there is clearly a very partial, not a total immersion in the case; and if it be to GRAFTING a branch upon a tree, the resemblance is still more imperfect. Still farther, as the Apostle in the same connection speaks of our being 'CRUCIFIED with Christ,' and that also by baptism, why do they not show us how immersion in water resembles the nailing of a body to a cross?

"But this striking and important text is not to be explained by a fancied resemblance between a burial, as they choose to call it, of the body in water, and the burial of Christ; as if a dip or a plunge could have any resemblance to that separation from the living, and that laying aside of a body in the sepulchre, which burial implies. This forced thought darkens and enervates the whole passage, instead of bringing forth its powerful sentiments into clearer view. The manifest object of the Apostle in the whole of this part of his epistle, was to show, that the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which he had just been establishing, could not, in any true believer, lead to licentiousness of life. 'What

then shall we say? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid! How shall we that are DEAD to sin, live any longer therein?' The reason, then, which is given by the Apostle, why true believers CANNOT continue in sin, is, that they are 'DEAD to sin,' which is his answer to the objection. Now, this mystical death to sin he proceeds to attribute to the INSTRUMENTALITY of baptism, taking it to be an act of that faith in Christ of which it was the external expression; and then he immediately runs into a favourite comparison, which, under various forms occurs in his writings, sometimes accompanied with the same allusion to baptism, and sometimes referring only to 'faith' as the instrument,—a comparison between the mystical death, burial, and resurrection of believers, and the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. This is the comparison of the text; not a comparison between our mystical death, and baptism; nor between baptism and the death and burial of Christ; either of which lay wide of the Apostle's intention.

"Now, to institute a comparison between a mode of baptism and the burial of Christ, wholly destroys the meaning of the passage; for how can the Apostle speak of baptism as an *emblem* of Christ's burial, when he argues from it as the instrument of *death* unto sin. and separation from it by a mystical burial? Nor is baptism here made use of as the emblem of our own spiritual death, burial, and resurrection. As an emblem, even immersion, though it might put forth a clumsy type of burial and rising again, is wanting in not being emblematical of DEATH: and yet all three, our mystical *death, burial, and rising again*, are distinctly spoken of, and must all be found represented in some TYPE. But the TYPE made use of by the Apostle is manifestly not baptism, but the death, the burial, and the resurrection of our Lord; and in this view he pursues this bold and impressive figure to even the verge of allegory, in the succeeding verses.

Having noticed all the arguments in favour of immersion, it now only remains to state, briefly, some of the principal arguments which go to show that pouring and sprinkling are both valid and scriptural.

1. I have already noticed and shown, the impossibility that John could have baptized by immersion the vast multitudes that flocked to his ministry and baptism.

2. It seems highly improbable, if not impossible, that the three thousand that were added to the Church on the day of Pentecost could have been baptized by immersion.

1. There was not sufficient time. It was nine o'clock when Peter commenced preaching, and from the topics

upon which he spoke, we must conclude that he was preaching a considerable time. After the conclusion of the sermon, more time must have been consumed, in separating the three thousand from the multitude,—receiving the proper evidence that they were in a proper state to receive baptism, and in making the necessary arrangements for their baptism; for if they were baptized by immersion, important arrangements were to be made. So that upon the most favourable supposition, the baptizing could not have begun before one o'clock, p. m. Now waiving the question of experiences, and allowing, for argument's sake, that they commenced the ceremony of baptizing at one o'clock, and that the twelve apostles were all baptizing at the same time, and that the three thousand were equally divided among them; then each one must have baptized two hundred and fifty in five hours, that is one for every minute and one-fifth. Baptizing at this rate, a very strong man might possibly hold out for an hour or two; but to suppose that any human strength is adequate to such a task for five hours in succession, transcends all belief.

2. But who can believe that the twelve apostles readily found twelve convenient places in Jerusalem for immersion? The strong probability is, that there was not one such suitable place in the whole city to which they could have access. It is true, the brook Cedron ran along the eastern side of the city; but, soon after its rise, it received, by a common sewer, all the blood, ordure, and common filth of the sacrifices of the temple, and northern part of the city; so that its waters were filthy, and entirely unfit for immersion. Besides, the time of which we are speaking, was after wheat-harvest,—say about the first of June; and as this brook was dry in the dry season, the strong probability is, that its waters were then very low, if it was not entirely dry. Besides this small stream, which, as we have seen, could not have served them, there were two pools in the city,—Bethesda and Siloam. The latter was near a mile from where they preached, and there is no account that the three thousand with the multitude of spectators were marched off to it. And if they had gone to it, it is not probable that the Jews, who had so recently put Christ to death, and who hated his followers with an almost mortal hatred, would have permitted them to take possession of it. But they had no time to go such a distance in search of a place for immersion. As to Bethesda; it is certain they could have had no access to that. It lay within the precincts of the temple, and was in the hands of the priests, who would never have given it up for such a purpose; especially as the time of the evening sacrifice was near at

hand, and as this pool was used in the temple service for washing the sacrifices, and as on this occasion (Pentecost) the sacrifices were important and numerous. Where, then, were the facilities for immersion?

3. There is not the slightest intimation, that they left the place at which Peter preached. So far we are informed by the sacred record, the baptizing and preaching were at the same place. And if so, immersion is excluded, for we are not authorized to travel out of the record to serve a mere opinion. Again: there is no mention of a change, or the changing of raiment, and not a moment of time for it. Indeed, no one can suppose, that of the vast multitude, drawn together on that occasion by mere curiosity, a single one went prepared with a change of raiment. Well, they could not be baptized naked. Decency forbade that. Nor could they be immersed in their clothing without a change at hand. Safety forbade that. We find, then, that the time, place, and all the circumstances forbid the idea of immersion. But on the other hand, all—the time—the place, and all the circumstances, decidedly favour the idea of pouring or sprinkling.

To all this Mr. Furman objects, and says: "It requires no longer time to immerse men and women, than is consumed in the sprinkling of babes." His taunt aside, he simply means to say, that to baptize by immersion requires no more time than to baptize by sprinkling. Can Mr. F. be serious in this declaration? Then let him be shown the utter incorrectness of it by a simple comparison. I will take him to Cedar Creek church, in which he delivered his memorable sermons,—a place favourable to him in the comparison, because the font is uncommonly near the church. We will suppose that a man offers for membership in the Baptist Church. I will not tax Mr. F. with the time consumed in giving in his experience,—I will throw that in to him; and we will suppose that the man has already received the right hand of fellowship, and that nothing remains but to immerse him. Then it will require two minutes to go to the font. It will require five minutes more to change raiment. It will require one minute more to lead the subject into the water,—repeat the ceremony, dip, and get out of the water. It will require five minutes more to change raiment again, and two minutes more to get back to the church. Then, here are fifteen minutes consumed in baptizing one, leaving out the time for his experience, and for all songs and prayers. And I venture to say, that a baptizing never yet took place at Cedar Creek, in which more than fifteen minutes did not elapse between leaving the church and getting back to it. Again, let us

suppose that when they leave the church to perform this immersion, a Methodist minister begins, in the chaste diction of Mr. F., "to sprinkle babes," and before they return, he will have baptized from thirty to forty. Then, here is at least thirty to one. And this comparison will generally hold good, if you take all the time and steps that precede and follow immersion, and compare them with those that precede and follow aspersion or affusion. Then Mr. F. never uttered a more absurd declaration than the above.

In a feeble attempt at ridicule, Mr. F. again says: "Some, in an indiscreet zeal, have invented a huge broom for the use of the administrator on the occasion under consideration. Standing on the margin of the stream, he is supposed to have dipped his besom into the water, and waved it over the heads of the surrounding multitude!" From what source Mr. F. obtained his notion of the big broom, I cannot tell. I doubt, though, his having obtained it from any Pædo-baptist author. However, that may be, such a conception is in perfect keeping with many of the vagaries of Mr. F. himself. In the very paragraph from which we have just quoted, he says, that if only the twelve baptized, the three thousand could have been immersed in an hour or two. That is, that all the apostles were baptizing precisely at the same time, and each one baptized about four every minute,—a thing utterly impossible. In the same paragraph, page 19, he makes out, that "the immersion of that vast multitude could have been easily accomplished in from ten to twenty minutes. *Mirabili dictu! Three thousand people immersed in from ten to twenty minutes!!* This ought to have a place among the wonders of the world, and Mr. F. ought to have all the renown of making the discovery. But seriously. Does Mr. F. believe it? If he does, he stands "solitary and alone;" for I venture to say that no other intelligent person in Christendom believes it. I perceive that Mr. F. was led into the above error by a "letter recently written by a baptist minister," who, I suppose, lives somewhere, though he does not say where, "in which he states, that he immersed thirty two persons in a little more than seven minutes," page 19. In this statement there is fraud; for the time consumed in hearing their experiences, giving the right hand of fellowship, going to the pool, changing raiment, preliminary service at the water, &c., &c., is not taken into the account at all. Now, I suppose, after all this was over, and the candidates were placed in the water side by side, that this nimble minister, in a close race against time, might have *ducked* the thirty two in seven minutes; but he could not have *baptized* them with that solemnity which the holy

ordinance requires. Arguing from the above brilliant exploit of the Baptist minister, Mr. F. concludes, that the twelve apostles could have immersed the three thousand in one or two hours, and, that if the seventy disciples assisted, it could have been done in a few minutes. But Mr. F. ought to know, first, that the twelve apostles would not desecrate the holy ordinance by running against time, in the administration of it, as his Baptist minister did. Secondly, that there is no evidence that the seventy assisted the twelve, but there is evidence to the contrary, as any one may see, by reading Acts ii. And, thirdly, that, upon the supposition that the seventy assisted the twelve, he will have to find eighty-two places in the city, suitable for immersion, when the fact is, he can scarcely find one such place to which they could have access. Then, after all the torturing and twisting to which the scripture in question has been subjected, it still speaks in favour of sprinkling or pouring, and against immersion.

3. The account given of the baptism of the jailor and his household, Acts xvi, most incontestibly shows that they were baptized in one apartment of the prison, and if they were, it is morally certain they were not immersed. The account is, that the jailor having received a strict charge to keep Paul and Silas safely, "*thrust them into the inner prison.*" But the quaking of the earth at midnight shook the foundations of the prison,—threw open the doors, and loosed the stocks from their feet. The jailor awoke in a fright, and seeing the doors all open, supposed the prisoners were gone, and was about to take his own life, knowing that by their escape his life was forfeited. But Paul cried out from within to let him know that they were all there, and told him to do himself no hurt. He, then, called for a light, and went trembling into their apartment, i. e. the inner prison, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out of the inner prison, and said, sirs, what must I do to be saved? Now the question is, where were they when the jailor had brought them out of the inner prison? Why they were manifestly in that part of the prison, which was between the inner prison and the jailor's apartment, which, also, was a part of the building; or, in other words, they were in the outer prison; for the *inner* prison implies that there was an *outer* prison. Well, here it was that the jailor was instructed to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and here it was that he and all his were baptized straightway. This is the plain account of the whole matter, and if so, then they were certainly baptized by pouring or sprinkling. But, says one: They were brought out, and that means they left the house entirely, and were out of doors.

If so, then the washing of their stripes,—the instruction of the jailor and all his house took place out of doors; for all this took place just where they stopped, after being brought out. Then did they all leave the house together, and that before baptism was spoken of? It must be so if the above notion is correct. But none can believe it, except those whose prejudice outweighs their common sense.

They were still in the house when all this took place; for the 32nd verse says: "And they spoke unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." But Mr. F. thinks they must have gone out in search of a river or pond, in as much as it is said, that after the washing of their stripes, baptism, &c., "he (the jailor) brought them into his house." Truly he brought them into his house,—his apartment of the building; but it was not from out of doors, but from the outer apartment of the prison part of the house, where the conviction of the jailor, the washing of the stripes of Paul and Silas, the instruction and baptism of the jailor, and all that were in his house, took place.

The hypothesis that they left the jail and went off in the night in search of water for immersion, is utterly incredible from several considerations.

1. In the whole history of immersion, it was never the case in a single instance, as I have been able to learn, that a company went off at midnight to a river or creek for immersion; and if nothing but immersion could have answered on that occasion, there can be no rational doubt but the apostles would have waited until day-time.

2. When the magistrates sent the serjeants next morning, saying "let those men go." St. Paul said: "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Now if they had left the prison in the night for the purpose of immersion, the reply of St. Paul was full of hypocrisy; for in the morning he refuses to leave the prison privately, when in the night he had been gone from the prison, privately, for a considerable time. For one, I am unwilling to alledge such hypocrisy against the apostle.

3. The earthquake which awfully shook the prison, must have aroused and alarmed the inhabitants, at least, in its immediate vicinity; so that they could hardly have gone out to a water-course or pool, and returned without detection. But if detected, the penalty of such an escape would have been certain death, at least to the jailor. Who then can believe that they, under the circumstances, would have left the prison?

Our Baptist brethren are not agreed among themselves,

as to the means by which they, on this occasion, arrive at the notion of immersion. Some take them out of the prison, and off to water. Others invent a tank or a pool in the jail. The fact is, the case is too hard for them.

4. When Peter, according to divine direction, went to Cæsarea and preached in the house of Cornelius, and the Holy Ghost came upon the Gentiles, to whom he preached, and they began to speak with tongues, and magnify the Lord, as related in Acts x, "he said, can any man forbid water that these should be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Now, what was the meaning of Peter when he said: "Can any man forbid water." Did he mean to ask if any could forbid their going to water? Or did he mean to ask if any could forbid water to be brought to them? Most assuredly he meant the latter. The import of the language will allow no other idea. If he had intended to convey the former idea; he would have said: can any man forbid our going *to* water, &c. Then if the sacred record is to be trusted, water was brought, and baptism was immediately administered in the same house in which Peter preached. And if so; this is a clear case of baptism by pouring or sprinkling.

5. It is certainly worthy of remark, that wherever the apostles preached, and conviction and baptism followed, there is not, in a single instance, the slightest intimation, that they left the place of preaching in order to baptize; but the preaching and baptism are always represented as taking place in the same house, or at the same place.

6. In i. Cor. x. 1, there is a remarkable passage, which conclusively proves that the baptism spoken of on that occasion, was by sprinkling or pouring. It reads thus: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." By referring to Exodus xiv, it will be seen, that they were not immersed; for the water stood as a wall on either hand, and they walked over the bed of the sea on "*dry ground*"—*dry shod*. But still they were baptized. Then it must have been by a mist or drops of rain from the cloud, which passed over them just before their entrance into the sea, and settled behind them, so as to hide them from the Egyptians; or by a spray from the sea, which must have been produced by the agitation of the waters, and the strong wind; and probably by both. But Mr. F. can see nothing but immersion in all this. Not literal, but "*figurative* immersion." Thus, to serve his purpose, he has transferred the passage from its literal mean-

ing into the regions of ideality, where he can twist it into any Protean shape that will suit his purpose. He says: "They went down into the deep,—the waters surrounded them, but the baptism, the *immersion*, was not complete until the cloud overshadowed them, &c., page 22. Then alas for Mr. F.! his "*figurative*" immersion never was complete; for, according to the sacred record, there was no cloud overshadowing the Israelites during their passage through the Red Sea, and I am surprised that he has read his Bible to so little purpose, as to think such a thing. The account is, (Exodus xiv. 19–21,) that just before the Israelites entered the passage through the sea, the cloud was before them, passed over and settled behind them, between them and the Egyptian camp, so as to hide them from the sight of the Egyptians. This is what the Bible says. But Mr. F. says the cloud spread over them during their passage through the sea, like a "canopy." Now, reader, which will you believe, Mr. F. or the Bible? Again: Mr. Furman's conceit, that they were "surrounded by water," will not hold good in another respect; for the passage through the sea was perfectly open from bank to bank. So they had dry ground before them, and dry ground behind them. Then, instead of their being "surrounded by water," it turns out that there was only the water of the sea on each side of them, and none above them, before them, or behind them. Hence, Mr. Furman's very splendid and "beautiful" idea of "figurative immersion" is spoiled at once.

The concluding remark of Mr. F. upon the passage in question, is truly amusing. He says: "Here (that is, in this "figurative immersion,") we have an illustrious type of christian baptism." Now christian baptism is itself a type of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Then, Mr. F. has found a type of a type.

If my Baptist brethren will not think it premature, I would just suggest to them, that on this occasion there were many children baptized. The account is, that there were six hundred thousand men, besides women and children, that passed over. Now, if the proportion of children was as common, there must have been many hundreds, if not some thousands, of them in company; and the apostle says they were *all* baptized. If this is not a clear case of infant baptism, then there is no sense in the account given. This, then, is an instance of that which Mr. F. so cordially detests,—a real bona fide case of "baby sprinkling." And what will he do with it? What kind of a *type* will he make of this? Of course he will again have recourse to the regions of ideality, types and shadows, and from thence

bring some figure, some illusive phantasm, by which he will attempt to explain it away. But after all his efforts, the case in hand will forever declare against immersion and in favour of infant baptism.

7. Water baptism represents the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and there ought always to be a fitness between the sign and the thing signified. This is a proposition which no sensible man will contradict. Then, if we can arrive at the mode of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that will settle the mode of water baptism. But this we can arrive at; for the Holy Ghost is uniformly said to be breathed upon us; to be shed forth; to come upon us; to be poured out upon us, &c.; and we are never said to be immersed into the Holy Ghost. Therefore, this ought to settle the question in favor of affusion, or pouring, as the more appropriate and significant mode of baptism.

8. In the account of Paul's baptism we can but infer that it took place in the house of Judas, where Ananias found him. The account is, that Ananias found him blind, and in deep concern. He spoke to him, the scales fell from his eyes, he arose forthwith, and was baptized. He then received meat and was strengthened. Acts ix. Here, as usual, there is not the slightest intimation that they left the house. But, on the other hand, every thing is represented as having taken place in the house; then immersion is excluded.

9. If we consult the prophets, we shall find much additional proof in favor of sprinkling and pouring as proper and valid modes of baptism. See Ezek. xxxvi, 25. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." See also Isa. lii. 15. "So shall he sprinkle many nations," &c. These prophecies refer, no doubt, to the christian dispensation, and by the terms, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you," and "he shall sprinkle many nations," they certainly refer to the cleansing influence of the Holy Ghost, upon the nations of the earth, under the emblem of the sprinkling of clean water; or they refer to water baptism literally. In either case, sprinkling is the mode. Then, if these prophets were proper judges, sprinkling is a valid and appropriate mode of baptism.

10. But, "the best of all is, the Lord is with us." We have the divine sanction, the signal fulfilment of that blessed promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." This is an argument which all the sectarian bias of our opponents cannot gainsay, and which all their sophistry steeped in inveterate prejudice, cannot overthrow. When people are doing wrong, and have the means of

knowing and doing better, the Lord never did, and never will bless and prosper them in that wrong. If, then, we are stained with popish heresy; if we are subverting the whole order of Christ's church, as our Baptist brethren alledge, by baptizing infants and adults, by pouring or sprinkling, we might rather look for the displeasure and curse of God upon our efforts, instead of his blessing. But what are the facts? In 1842, the accession to the membership of the M. E. Church was 154,000; and during the last conference year, it was considerably over 100,000. And even on the Wadesborough circuit, during the last year, under the ministry of brothers Durant and Tarrant, it was more than one thousand. And I here remark, I trust with all humility, that during the one hundred years since the rise of the M. E. Church, she has prospered without a parallel. The living epistles of our apostleship are to be seen and read almost every where. I do not make these remarks in disparagement of any sister protestant Pædobaptist church. The Lord has blessed all. Then, what does all this mean? Does it mean that we are wrong; that we are subverting the order of Christ's church; that we savor of popish heresy; that we are not even in the pale of Christ's visible church? Our Baptist brethren may, if they choose, continue to make these declarations; to bring these allegations against us: but why should we heed them while we have the divine sanction; the living seal of God's approbation. They may go about privately, as they do, and endeavour to unsettle the minds of young christians, by making them believe they cannot be saved unless they are immersed. But we will pursue the even tenor of our way; laboring to convert sinners from the error of their ways. And, instead of trying to pull down other churches, in a private, clandestine way, we will labor to build up all christians "in the faith once delivered to the saints." And the Lord will bless us more than he blessed them; he will honor us with more converts, as he ever has done, *because our work is better.*

But our Baptist brethren themselves being judges we are right; for they are always glad to get a member from our revivals, and when they succeed in proselyting one of our weakest members, (and they hardly ever get any other sort,) they exult as though they had found great spoil.

In his sermons at Cedar Creek, Mr. F. used expressions which he has not seen fit to publish. In this he acted wisely; for some things which he there said, would show badly in print. As he has not published them, I am not disposed to notice them. Yet, to one remark which I recollect, I will pay a little attention. He said, that "every

tub must stand upon its own bottom." He then very cordially invited all Pædo-baptists to come over to his church. Well, before we go over, I think it would be well to examine his tub, and see if it is a safe vessel. Is it well hooped? Let us see. Where is the hoop of a wholesome and uniform system of church polity? Alas! there is no such thing to be found,—every stave in the tub,—every congregation in the church, stands disconnected in this respect.

Well, it may be that the hoop of the final perseverance of the saints holds it together. Not quite. Though most of the staves cry out,—can't fall,—can't fall; yet some few of them begin to say we are not quite so sure of it, and are rather afraid to trust that hoop, and they refuse to be pressed in by it. Hence that hoop hangs loosely to the tub and affords it but little strength.

But let us look again. I see a part of a very flimsy old hoop here called, "*a h o p e*," which seems to have been substituted for the direct witness of the spirit. Some are still holding on to it, but others are afraid fully to trust it. They want something more certain. Hence this hoop, or "hope" don't go quite around the tub.

Again: Where is the strong hoop of christian perfection. Alas! the framers and repairers of the vessel never thought of trying such a hoop. Probably because of the ancient cry,—"a little sin to keep us humble."

Well, let us search for the hoop of "free grace" or universal salvation,—i. e. that Christ died for all, and that all may be saved. Though this hoop at first was spurned, and entirely rejected, yet some of late are earnestly trying to get it round the tub. May God prosper their efforts; for the vessel will never be strong without it.

But where is the old hoop of Calvinism, that used to stand so high upon the tub? Indeed I find, that since the true light has been shining, and the doctrine of free salvation has been winning its widening way, that hoop has been gradually getting lower, until now it is in the mud below the bottom of the tub; and although now and then one reaches down his hand to raise it up to light, (for many still love it,) yet from its native ugliness, it shrinks from the enlightened gaze, and seeks its hiding place.

Then, I inquire again; surely there is some hoop of uniform doctrine that reaches round the tub. Brethren where is your formula of doctrine,—your creed upon which you all meet? The Bible.—the Bible; is the reply. Ah, the Bible? But Unitarians, Universalists, Arminians, Predestinarians, Catholics and Mormons, all profess to believe the Bible. We want to know how you understand the Bible.

What does it mean? Where is your creed, we ask again? We have none but the Bible, is the reply. Then, from this reply, we cannot tell what you hold. The fact is, you have had almost as many creeds as Daniel's beast had heads and horns. I have before me, at this time, several of your creeds; as the creed of the Georgia Baptist Association; and the Baptist Kehukee Association, printed in 1829, and of the Welsh Neck Association, which has to it the names of the Rev's. W. Dossey and James Thomas, with many others. And even Mr. F. gives us a summary of Baptist faith in his sermon of 1840, already alluded to. And yet our Baptist brethren say, they have no creed.

But I am weary with the search. Is there no hoop that goes quite around this tub? Yes, there is one, and that is immersion. But the Rev. Robert Hall, of England, in advocating open communion, cut a big notch in this hoop, which has never been healed, (I am speaking of exclusive immersion) and, some of these days, the force of a liberal and enlightened Christianity, will burst this sectarian hoop to flinders, and then, what will become of the tub? No, Mr. F., you will excuse us, if you please. We can't trust your tub. And we would just here, in a friendly way, suggest to you, that we think you will do well to keep your own tub standing upon its own bottom.

In conclusion, I will take occasion to remark, that this reply has been delayed longer than I intended or wished. But I plead my unusually feeble health in extenuation of that delay.

Whether this controversy will result in any good, I cannot tell. One thing I know, I did not commence it, but was reluctantly forced into it; and, while I regret the necessity which thus forced me, I expect to remain on the field as long as that necessity continues.

As soon as my health, and the requisitions upon my time will permit, I shall prepare and publish a reply to Mr. Furman's sermon on Infant Baptism. And, as Mr. F. has seen fit to talk about the origin of other churches, he will excuse me, if, in my next, I reciprocate the kindness by briefly giving the history of his own church.

If, in any of the preceding pages, I have seemed to be harsh, I can truly say, I have not set down aught in malice. Such as the performance is, I dedicate it to my brethren of this part of the country, who so earnestly required it of me, relying upon their indulgence more than upon the merit of the performance.